DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 200 526 SP 017 499

AUTHOR Stake, Bernadine Evans; Stake, Robert Earl
TITLE Non-Sexist Teacher Education Project Field Trial. Evaluation Report.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 85p.; Colored pages may not reproduce clearly.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; Feminism; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Learning Modules; *Program Evaluation; Sensitivity Training; *Sex Bias; *Sex Fairness; Sex Stereotypes; Social Change; *Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

Five teacher training modules on the topic of sex equity in the classroom were evaluated during and following a field trial at ten universities. Evaluation consisted of observation of classrooms, interviews with instructors and students, and pretest posttest attitude scaling of the students. The inquiry was intended to reveal the perceived importance of the sex equity issues, the instructional activities of each classroom, the impact of the instruction, and the quality of the materials as perceived by teachers and students. Participants agreed that the issues were an important consideration in teacher education, and that more options should be open for children of both sexes. The attitude scale results showed small but consistent increases in these same directions from pretest to posttest. Discussions with participants are summarized, and copies of the evaluation instruments are included in this report. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED200526

Non-Sexist Teacher Education Project Field Trial

EVALUATION REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bernadine Evans Stake
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Bernadine Evans Stake and Robert Earl Stake

304 W Iowa St. Urbana, Illinois

April 1980

SP 017499

Non-Sexist Teacher Education Field Trial
Evaluation Report

Summary

The Non-Sexist Teacher Education Project (NSTEP) was funded by the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare to develop adjunct teacher training materials on the topic of sex equity in the classroom. Under the direction of Myra and David Sadker of American University, five modules (student booklets plus teacher guides) were written by different authors for use in 3 courses or sequences common to preservice education programs.

The NSTEP directors arranged a field trial of these materials during the academic year 1979-80 at ten diverse universities across the United States. Three (or more) cooperating instructors were found at each of the colleges. A selection of materials was used at the discretion of each instructor, with the expectation that at least a week of instruction would be given on the topic of sex equity. With the hope that these materials would be appropriate for diverse colleges and with the knowledge that the sequence and content of teacher education vary from campus to campus, uniformity in placement and teaching style was not expected.

Bernadine and Bob Stake, evaluation specialists, were hired to evaluate the usefulness and effectiveness of the NSTEP materials during this field trial. Their plan called for direct observation in the field trial classrooms, interviews with instructors and students plus logs from the same, and pretest posttest attitude scaling of all students enrolled. The inquiry was intended to reveal the perceived importance of the sex equity issues, the instructional activity of each classroom, the impact of the instruction and the quality of the materials as perceived by instructors and students.

Classroom observations--for the most part--found an array of talented instructors at work, most of them predisposed to examining the ways teachers have reinforced sex role stereotyping. And found interested students, responsively examining the claims and counterclaims of sex equity from their experience and their readings. Almost without exception all agreed that the issues were an important consideration in teacher education, and most expressed a conviction to help keep more options open for children of both sexes. The attitude scale results showed small but consistent increases in these same directions from pretest to posttest. Suggestions for changing the NSTEP materials were varied and for some modules contorted, with favorable responses greatly outnumbering unfavorable.

What was not learned from the field trial was how the materials would work with instructors who were required to use them, a common circumstance in teacher education courses, rather than those volunteering, and even (as here) favorably disposed to the project or its personnel.

Non-Sexist Teacher Education Field Trial
Evaluation Report

Table of Contents

Page	
	Summary
1	Field Trial Arrangements
1	Sex Equity Instruction
2	Expectations
3	The Evaluation Study
3	Foreshadowing Questions
5	On-Site Observations
5	Instructional Styles
6	The Students
6	Individual Site Descriptions
7	Houston
10	Miami
13	New York City
16	Northern Colorado
18	Oregon
22	San Francisco
25	Tallahassee
28	Western Michigan
31	Illinois
39	Attitudes of Students
45	Importance of Sex Equity Issues
60	Self Ratings of Impact
67	Attitudes of Particular Issues
69	Reactions to the NSTEP Materials
71	Reactions of Non-Participants
73	Meta-Evaluation of the Field Trial
74	The Evaluation
75	Teaching about Sexism in Schools

Course	Instructor	Students
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY, Washington, D.C.		
Foundations of Education	Martha Umstott	25
Methods of Teaching Social Studies	Donni Hassler	15
Methods of Teaching Language Arts	Donni Hassler	18
Psychology of Education	Franz Huber	28
BANK STREET COLLEGE, New York City		
Fundamentals of Child Development	Peggy Cole	20
Curriculum in Early Childhood Education	Harriet Cuffaro	26
Principles and Problems of Teaching	Ruby Takanishi	20
FLORIDA A & M UNIVERSITY, Tallahassee		
Social Foundations of Education	Charles Stanley (Cooper)	23
Social Foundations of Education	Charles Stanley (Mercer)	26
Educational Psychology	James Byrd	15
Children's Literature	Elinor Ellis	21
Theory and Practice of Teaching	Elinor Ellis	22
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, Houston		
Introduction to the Foundations of Education	Dov Liberman	19
Introduction to Professional Teaching	Rick Newlin	32
Generic Teaching Strategies	Kit Newman	32
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Urbana-Champaign		
History of Education	Paul Violis	180
Educational Psychology	Lu Ann Smith	120
Child Development for Elementary Teachers	Lu Ann Smith	100
Fundamentals of Reading Techniques	Karen Margolis	39
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI, Miami, Florida		
Introduction to the Study of Education	Jerry Felz	32
Psychological Bases of Education	Ziva Peleg	8
Secondary Education	Evaleen Lorton	25
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, Eugene		
History of American (U.S.) Education	Toby Edson	45
Educational Psychology	Janet Moursand	100
Reading & Writing in the Secondary School	Terry Bullock	10
NORTHERN COLORADO UNIVERSITY, Greeley		
Foundations of Education	Michael Jacobs	29
Developmental Psychology for Educators	Kyle Carter	36
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY, San Francisco		
Analyzing School Behavior/Elem Sch Curric	Thomassine Sellers	30
Curriculum in Elementary Schools	James Bixler	83
Seminar in Secondary Education	Ray Roberts	18
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, Kalamazoo		
Social, Phil., Hist. Perspec of Young Child	Michael Howard	19
School and Society	Norma Hungerford	16
Seminar in Early Childhood Education	Mary Cain	18

Field Trial Arrangements

The table on the opposite page indicates the participating universities, the participating instructors, their courses and the number of students participating. Several universities were those at which NSTEP materials authors were faculty members: American, Miami, and Oregon. The University of Illinois was added to make it convenient for the evaluation specialists to observe classroom activities over an extended period.

A variety of teacher training institutions and student bodies was sought. Three of the ten were former state colleges having institutional emphasis on training teachers: Northern Colorado, San Francisco State, and Western Michigan. Florida A&M is an almost exclusively Black institution, while the numbers of non-white participating students at American, Miami, and Houston was in the vicinity of 50%. About 80% of the students in these 33 courses were female, about 60% and 25% were preparing to teach in elementary and secondary schools respectively, and almost 20% (regardless of their level of preparation) were not intending to teach at all. Almost all the students were without experience as teachers. Most were enrolled as undergraduates though a few elsewhere and at Bank Street College--where most of the students were practicing teachers--were enrolled at the graduate level.

Sex Equity Instruction. Most of the cooperating instructors indicated that they would normally include sex equity as a topic in their courses, but not to the formal extent anticipated in this field trial. Each set of materials (booklet and teacher guide) covered what might be assigned to a class as one week's assignment. These instructors were free to devote more or less, however they saw it fit their instructional plan. The different ways in which the topic was presented are indicated in the case reports to follow--clearly there was no uniformity of use. But this was expected and desired, because, though in many colleges of education study materials to be purchased by the student are selected at the department level, most instructors are free to supplement the readings and to use them as they see fit.

At several schools some students were allowed or even expected to enroll in more than one of the field trial courses during this semester. Usually different NSTEP materials were used. Some students commented that this was not objectionable overattention to the topic. A few suggested the materials should be included in multiple courses.

Thirty instructors originally agreed to participate in the field trial. Juanita Lewis (Northern Colorado) dropped out. Peggy Cole did not make the materials available to her fall-term students but participated in the evaluation (her results are presented herein separately). She did not address the sex equity topic in her class. She planned a more complete try-out of the materials in the spring (1980). Donni Hassler assigned the materials but indicated to the students that they would not be tested, found out they did not read the materials, suggested that her results be withdrawn from the evaluation (they are presented here separately), then taught another class in the winter term with more complete participation. James Byrd talked another instructor into using them too, but the latter's course was not included in the evaluation. Four instructors used them in two sections each. Jim Bixler used them in four sections. Paul Violis had students in 19 sections read and discuss the materials but did not use the NSTEP materials in his large group lectures. Lu Ann Smith used the materials in separate presentations to each of 12 different sections of two courses. Out of this array emerged an evaluation of 30 participating courses, broken for some small group presentations into 46 sections.

The instructors gathered for a 2-day orientation session in downtown Washington September 14-15, 1979. Many had already begun their course instruction. A few were planning to use the NSTEP materials in a winter or spring course. They heard plans for the field trial and its evaluation, and examined, many for the first time, the materials to be available for use. (The supply to be distributed to students was sent out about two weeks later.) The group heard a presentation on sex equity in classrooms by Rita Bornstein, one of the authors. There was a presentation of Myra and David's textbook study. Leslie Wolfe from HEW discussed WEEA grants. There were discussions of the arrangements and the materials, and to a lesser extent, the social and educational issues. Professors Violis and Edson expressed concern about omissions in the history module. They and all instructors were encouraged to identify changes that could be made in a final revision of materials. All were reminded, though, that the principal purpose of the field trial was not to provide a critique of the materials (other efforts to this end were ongoing) but to gain an understanding of how the materials in their present form would work in the teacher education courses.

The modules had been designated as follows:

Unit	Primarily for:	Authors	Title
1	Introduction to Educ.; Social Fdns. of Educ.	Rita Bornstein, University of Miami	Sexism in American Education
2	History of Educ.	Linda K. Kerber, University of Iowa	Woman's Place is in the Schools: The Impact of Women on Amer. Educ.
3	Educational Psychology; Child Study	Joyce P. Gall & Meredith D. Gall, University of Oregon	Boys and Girls in Schools: A Psychological Perspective
4	Teaching Methods	Myra Sadker & David Sadker, American University	Between Teacher and Student: Overcoming Sex Bias in the Classroom
5	Curriculum; Elementary Educ.; Secondary Educ.	Donna M. Gollnick, AACTE, and Myra and David Sadker, American U.	Beyond the Dick & Jane Syndrome: Confronting Sex Bias in Instructional Materials

Expectations. The original NSTEP plan called for two modules (sometimes called units) to be used in an introductory or foundations course and another two to be used in a teaching methods or curriculum course, with a single unit or module to be used in an educational psychology or child study course. (A sixth module for a practice teaching experience was not completed in time for the field trials.) By the time of the orientation session the expectation appeared to have settled on about what would be taught in a week of a semester long course, which translates approximately into three hours of group instruction and six hours of student preparation. It was not expected that that time would be devoted exclusively to the NSTEP materials, but that there also would be subsequent reference and perhaps review of them. It was not anticipated that many instructors would test student learnings on these teachings or that department final examinations would devote attention to them.

Another expectation of importance was that there would be a variety of instructional arrangements, of teaching styles, of student experience and frame of mind, and of community attitudes toward sex-equity advocacy. The authors of the materials had recognized this potential diversity, and the project directors wanted to encounter it. No extensive effort had been made to have one module (more than the others) orient to a subpopulation, for example to the more sophisticated students or to a resolution of fundamentalist and equity views.

And a third expectation, especially of the evaluators, was that the students would come to this instruction with a substantial relevant experience, with some awareness of sex role stereotyping (especially in textbooks) and that the materials and accompanying instruction would not so much increase their knowledge as it would increase their attention to that knowledge, and that the most notable impact would be that a few, perhaps only 1 in 10, would have a special moment of insight, something of a revelation, that they would hold and value for a long time. Field observations and testing were planned from these expectations.

The Evaluation Study. According to the plan presented by the evaluators a week-long visit would be made to six of the sites, the project people at American University would observe instruction there, and observations would be made throughout the semester at the University of Illinois. A follow up was scheduled at the two sites where the materials had seemed to work best and worst. As scheduling problems arose and no two sites emerged as having clearly better or worse usage, the plan was adjusted to allow a brief visit to each of the sites other than American University. The final visit, to Greeley in January, lasted only a single day.

When planning the evaluation a set of "foreshadowing questions" were listed:

1. Are the materials used according to the expectations of project staff and local faculty? What departures were found necessary? Why? What options were there? What were the principal barriers to implementation? Did the orientation session help? Were the instructor manuals helpful?

2. How well did the sex equity materials integrate into the regular course offerings? What topics and experiences preceded and followed their use? How were they introduced and justified to the students? What were the opportunity costs? Did instructors bring in materials of their own to supplement the sex equity materials (from NSTEP)?

3. What was the reaction of the students? What did they learn? Did they feel that such instruction was needed? Did it help them? Did they think the materials were well done? thought provoking? What differences were there among different kinds of students?

4. How did the instructors feel about the materials? Were they scholarly enough? Were they seen as accurate? Did they feel such instruction was needed? Did it help them? Did they think the materials were well done? thought provoking? How did instructors react to the orientation? Did instructors having and not having the orientation react differently to the materials? What other differences were there in instructor reactions?

5. How did administrators and other nearby people respond to the tryouts?

6. Do students, instructors, administrators, and others take cultural pluralism into account?

7. What were the opinions of various people as to the best time to use these materials? Is a special coordination of their use across courses? What kind of coordination seems best?

8. How much of the field trial was jeopardized by materials and coordination not being ready or well thought out?

9. How much study and obligation were the students assigned? Did the work affect their grades in the course? Who did and who did not take the assignment seriously? Was there an expression of ridicule directed toward the instructors and these materials for bringing up the sex equity issues?

Each instructor was asked to keep a log of events and impressions of the NSTEP instruction. And each was asked to identify two students who would be willing to keep logs of the same. It was not indicated that the logs should be of any particular length or detail, just a record of a few things that the NSTEP people might find useful to know. Excerpts from the logs are included in the case report (for each class) which follows in the next section.

The evaluators constructed attitude scales for pretest and posttest administration by the instructors, the pretest prior to introducing the topic formally and the posttest perhaps a couple of weeks after principal attention to sex-equity had ended. It was suggested that 10 minutes would be ample for students to respond to each scale. The items were intended to reveal the importance of the sex equity issues in the minds of the students, the perceptions they had of their own knowledge of teacher roles in exacerbating and relieving the problems, and their feelings about particular manifestations of differential treatment of boys and girls. The scales were relatively crude and failed to record individual feelings precisely, but established a consistent pattern of responses favorable to the instruction and the instructional materials.

During visits to the sites Bernadine interviewed the instructors and a couple of their students, not necessarily the students who had kept logs. Her questions centered on the following:

(for instructors) How did you introduce "teacher responsibility for equity?" How did you use the NSTEP materials? What was good (and bad) about them? How should they be improved? How did you evaluate student learning? What did these lessons accomplish? Did any students experience a momentous insight? Were male and female responses different?

(for students) How were the ideas presented? What was your assignment? Did you gain ideas for remedying sex inequities in your own classrooms? Should you have more or less instruction on sexism? Did you feel you experienced a special awakening to these problems?

Answers to these questions are indicated in the case statements in the next section and are summarized thereafter.

On-Site Observations

The NSTEP materials were successfully placed into the mainstream of teacher training in nine universities. They remained outside the flow at Bank Street College.

Most instructors concentrated their attention to matters of sex equity into a single place, a single stretch, in the course sequence--a few spread it out more deliberately throughout the term. Class time primarily devoted to the topic was (grossly) estimated to be three hours, ranging from a high of about six hours in Ellis' courses to almost none in Cuffaro's course, with additional time of course spent in out-of-class student study. This is no small amount of attention, representing perhaps 1% of the total formal learning time for an average student during a whole academic year.

Instructional Styles. The bulk of class time was spent in discussion and at-your-seat exercises, with lectures not uncommon. Most instructors continued their usual teaching styles, some (e.g., Violis) finding the teaching materials not accommodating nicely to those styles. In Miami Ziva Peleg said, "It serves best as a resource rather than a central guide. But that's my bias--that's the way I use all material. I was comfortable using these."

Four instructors brought in speakers, and in fact Smith, Stanley and Liberman were "guests" in field trial sections belonging to someone else. At least four showed films, one played the album Free to Be You and Me. Various reading materials other than NSTEP's were assigned or made available and sex role research was amplified and interpreted in at least five courses.

Ray Roberts, as he does with other topics, had students "peer-teaching." Elinor Ellis, Kit Newman, Karen Margolis and Mary Cain had students into the schools observing the interactions of teachers and students. Kit had students video-tape 10 minutes of their own work with children. Jim Bixler had students doing audio-tape self-analyses.

Instructors using units 4 and 5 seemed to relate them more to actual teacher-learner interaction, partly because more of the students were doing in-school observations or teaching.

Sex equity was a new concept for many students. When the topic was first brought up many seemed to need an opportunity to express their own experiences and values. Discussions were seldom low-key, often combative. Kit Newman felt that such personal exploration was a necessary first step. But all too often the instruction didn't get beyond personal recollection and declaration. The criticism that it did not go beyond "consciousness raising" was voiced in several places. As might be supposed, in courses where students were required to read the materials before class the discussions were more substantial, less filled with reminiscence, approximating more the NSTEP objective to move toward a realization of teacher responsibility.

Usually, of course, no more than a few parts of the modules were discussed. It seemed difficult for instructors to draw the class back toward integrating this topic with other course concepts. The students sometimes complained that the module seemed just "squeezed in" but the volatility of the ideas made smoother integration a problem.

The Students. On all of the field trial campuses, observers noted that students displayed little of the moral indignation and reformist commitment of that visible, audible group of students in the late sixties. So it was that their response to sex equity was personal rather than societal. They seemed sincere in their efforts to learn about sex equity, to aspire to providing options to all children. Generally, from interviews, it seemed that inequities in salaries and educational opportunity were seen as vitally important. Jim Bixler said that women in their twenties at San Francisco State had accepted sex equity as a fact of life. Lu Ann Smith said that Illinois students had grown up hearing about sex equity, and unlike students a few years ago, were not apprehensive about it.

The complexities of the issues seemed greatest when sex equity for women conflicted with "What's best for the family?" Most students in Houston, as elsewhere, believed that nothing should be done to deter girls from a formal education and academic excellence. However, in Houston especially, when the responsibilities of the family were discussed, to many students the teachings of the Bible prevailed. Seeing the Biblical husband as head of the household, many women students expected to take care of house and home--in addition to a career, and were willing to sacrifice their career if necessary. Some objected to having husbands share housework or child care. The same commitments were expressed other places too of course, and by men as well as women.

There was a wide range of awareness at the outset at every site. At Illinois students represented the full spectrum from Phyllis Schlafley positions to Radical Feminist positions. In discussions there often appeared to be two camps, but closer study showed the bulk of the students nearer a neutral stand. At Bank Street, San Francisco State and Illinois discussions carried into matters of Gay Rights. At Florida A&M and Western Michigan comparisons were made to race equity.

Although many students had internalized some sense of sex equity, most had not considered many of the subtle manifestations of inequity, such as interaction patterns in the classroom, invisibility of women in historical accounts, and costs of discrimination to men. By the end of presentations they had become aware of such, at least as interpretations, and a largely increased number felt that the issue of sex equity was important.

Individual Site Descriptions. Beginning on the following page are brief descriptions of the use of NSTEP materials in each field trial classroom.

HOUSTON

The University of Houston is serene, an island in the tumult of the city of Houston. In District schools the Mexican American and Black children outnumber anglos. There is lots of talk against Federal Government and its mandated programs, such as Mainstreaming and Title IX. This is an area with jobs for new teachers as new houses, new schools and new cities are "abuilding." The University's College of Education has a national reputation as the birthplace of "competency-based education."

Using Unit 1

One male and twelve female students sat 'round tables discussing their experiences in teaching. The young man spoke in favor of corporal punishment. He had brought a Houston Post article about Abraham Lass, once a NYC principal saying that schools should be more authoritarian, more repressive even. The discussion shifted back and forth from discipline to multiculturalism. Some of the students were bilingual and favored bilingual teaching, others wanted to teach only in English. One Black spoke against school integration: "I've been with Blacks all my life. I can teach them better and smooth the way. You can teach whites better, I can teach Blacks better."

It was a course titled Introduction to Education but many had taught and most knew many of the key issues of Education. Drawing them toward thinking of the issue of sex equity in the classroom, Rick Newlin first had them complete the quiz booklet (p. 6) on women in the field of work. Later Rick said, "I felt the questions were perfect for stimulating thinking, providing a base for class discussions. When the sex characteristics profile was administered and tallied, the students were shocked to learn what the psychologists reported (instructor's guide). I also used the role play activity (instructor's guide); this worked well and got their interest up."

Rick had taken out "How to Diagnose and Design a Program for Mainstreaming" to make room for the NSTEP work. He fitted it into 3 ninety-minute sessions, working with them in the first session before having them read "Sexism in American Education." Some of the teacher guide activities were not usable--for here, as elsewhere, the number of males in the class was small. Rick noted that being a male in Education makes one aware of sexism. He found the module well written, making "the case" well.

One student thought Emma (from the booklet story) very much like herself. She had quit school to get married, now is divorced. She goes to Bible class, believes as the Bible says that if you are married your first responsibility is to your children and husband. Her mind wasn't changed by the materials.

There were several students who opposed including this non-sexist material in the course. Some thought it unneeded, too much was being done already. Some spoke against this "spending money to study differences between men and women."

A Black mother of 3 came down on both sides: "This issue of women's rights, female rights, to me, being Black, is not the main issue. I feel like now I'm getting my rights as a person. One good thing I got out of this is Title IX. I hadn't heard of it. I want to find out more about it. And after reading this book I'm going to see if I'm warmer to my boys than to Sandy. You know I'm very close to my boys and I'm not very close to Sandy. This book is making me think I'm giving subtle messages to Sandy."

Two women still more favorably disposed said, "...about punishing girls. I thought I don't do that--and then I thought, 'Oh, yes, I do.' And I liked the way the definitions were given and the text was broken up into categories."

"A teacher should do everything possible to enhance each personality. I realized sex equity was for men too and that's one of the strong points."

Using Unit 3, with some attention to Unit 4

Dov Liberman taught a week (3 hours in class) on sex equity in Carolyn Hudson's course, Introduction to Foundations of Education. He asked the students to read Boys and Girls in School; A Psychological Perspective (because the course had a strong emphasis on psychological foundations) but also handed out the booklet, Between Teacher and Student: Overcoming Sex Bias in the Classroom.

Dov lectured and led discussion on different approaches to learning, pointing out that socialization and biological theories were presented in the module, but that constructionist theory of learning was not. He said he did not subscribe to the approaches presented so would give them a Constructionist view, one from the same frame of reference as Piaget's stage developmental approach. He said that what was being developed was not masculinity or femininity but a sense of "self." He went on to discuss Kohlberg's stage theory and androgeny.

He interspersed his offerings with questions such as "What does the word 'socialization' mean?" and "Name some people who have not been socialized," and "Do teachers have anything to do with the differences in expectation of socialization of boys and girls?" The students responded quickly and with relevance.

Later, a student who left a physical therapist program because of the math requirement said, "I could have been used as the example. We read that girls excel in all subjects early, then something happens in math. That's the way I was until the middle of sixth grade. Ever since, math has been a problem. I had quite a few male friends who had no problems with math at all.

Another student said, "I believe absolutely that women should have equal opportunities. If they're doing the same job and if they can do the same job well enough they should be paid the same. But as far as all that other stuff about women's lib, the woman being the head of the house, anything along that line, I'd be absolutely against because I am a Born Again Christian and I know the Bible is the Word of God. ... I wouldn't recommend the materials and I wouldn't want to read more."

Carolyn Hudson's reaction was: I think it is imperative that teachers be aware of what is going on in the field. I'm not sure answers are in. I'm not sure we can get up and make statements about sex role identity and where it should go versus where it is now. But, you know, I think times are changing. It is legislated. It is here to stay. I think the materials are excellent. I was kind of excited with it. I thought it well presented and was disappointed it wasn't published.

Dov commented again that he felt that other perspectives than the straight learning perspective should be incorporated into Unit 3. He would not recommend using the modules without modification. He was particularly upset with Unit 4 where the kids are doing the play and the teacher is the controlling element in the situation. He said that it was a mistake to make so little distinction between the ages of the boys and girls in the materials and concluded with the feeling that perhaps the lessons should be taught at the masters level rather than with people "who haven't been out there."

Using Units 4 and 5

According to Kit Newman, instructor in Houston's Generic Teaching Strategies, "It is important to know people and their feelings before teaching. The subject of sex equity is emotionally heavily laden. It's impossible and undesirable to leave the emotions out."

A female student said she'd rather say "fair" than "equal." She didn't want men and women to be equal. When Kit asked her to explain she said, "Women should be able to do any job. Tax laws and inheritance laws should be fair. But the woman should be in charge at home. The man should not have to cook or take care of the kids."

A male student said he wanted to see the family unit stabilized. He didn't want women to dress like him. "We don't want to be like China--unisex. Now it's getting so women are hired if they are qualified or not."

After asking them to predict the future with both optimistic and pessimistic visions, which they did, she led a discussion of differences in boys' and girls' achievement and the classroom interaction of teachers and students. Later in her Log she wrote: ..."of hopes and fears for the future, one woman's hope is another's fear. I was somewhat surprised that no mention was made of matters such as work opportunities, pay, chance for advancement, education, sports, ... There was a dominant concern for the quality of childrearing. Apparently these people aware of discrimination against women in so many aspects of society, rationalize it to themselves in some way. Largely by assuming that the maternal parent is the only one who can rear a child, and if women abdicate this role there can be no substitute."

Later a student interviewee said, "After reading 'Between Teacher and Student' I felt hostile about it. I think it was because it was kind of attacking me as a teacher. It says you are going to be doing this and I am saying I don't think I do that. But even though I did get a negative reaction, I'm glad I read it. I did get something out of it even though it hurt my feelings. The other module about text books was more objective."

Fundamentalism vs. liberationism came up again and again. Another interviewee, pregnant and working while taking courses, said: "I'm what you know as a Morman, so we have opposing views. My religion is very 'pro-family.' I kind of feel guilty that I'm here now. My little girl is at my sister's. But I kind of feel that it should be equal because sometimes you have to work, and women need to have the opportunity to make more. I don't agree with all the issues in ERA but one of the best things they've done is to make maternity covered by insurance. Believe me, I needed that. When they had the big Women's Conference in Houston all you heard about was abortion and homosexuality. Doesn't ERA advocate pay for abortions?" She was a bright, outgoing woman, one who had wanted in high school to play soccer rather than dodge ball, to have "whacks" (like the boys) for punishment rather than after-school detentions.

Kit saw her role as discussion leader, avoiding advocacy, encouraging students to express their own ideas. "I think you have to be very cautious with attitudes that go back to their religion, their sex roles, and their images of themselves." She spoke of trust, noting that it was easier for her to speak of sex equity in a class of students she had been with much longer.

Kit objected to the workbook format of the modules. She liked the resources in the Dick and Jane module, wanted still more information, possibly in appendices because she thought the modules even now a bit too long.

MIAMI

Among Ficus benjamina and banyan trees, with fifty-four flights daily to New York City, with Radio Moscow now on the AM dial, with Spanish shouting as common as English, America's subtropical city: Miami. Its major campus, lying outside the city limits in Coral Gables, is an urban campus, hurry-scurry, daily commuting students and professors, not at all paced by the Confederacy to the north. But the hospitality is strictly southern.

Using Unit 3

Ziva Peleg had 5 women and 3 men in her graduate seminar, Psychological Bases of Education. She said, "There was an awful lot of interest in the topic (sex equity) in general. I'm such an avid feminist, without fail I get them interested in the topic."

Sex equity was presented in this course as a part of a discussion of sex role development. Ziva introduced two contrasting theories of personality development, and examined sex role identity from the point of view of the two. Using Erickson, the idea was to show that in our society, women have less of an opportunity to develop a sense of identity during stage 5 than men do, and they end up deriving their identity from their husband and children. The Gall and Gall booklet and related material was used to support a social learning theory explanation of sex role development. Ziva said that the module "provides a resource for things I already was doing. As it is it serves best as a resource rather than a central guide. But that's my bias because that's the way I use all materials. I was comfortable using these."

Ziva thought the level of the materials was in-between the best for undergraduates and graduate students. For the latter she wanted more concrete supportive data to the more general statements made. But "the undergraduates could care less about those numbers. In fact, too many numbers scare them off, make it too cumbersome."

She said, "It's not hard to read, but it's not exciting either. It's not bad. It's not wonderful. More examples would help. It is not very personalized, either for male or female students. It stays remote. I find that things that impress students are things that they can relate to. I usually show my undergrads the NOW presentation of the text book study. There is always lots of enthusiasm for and against. They come up with ideas of things they feel and things they remember. I don't think the module elicits that response."

The students indicated they were favorably impressed with the materials. One suggested it would be helpful to have included some strategies for working with children. Another indicated she was aware of sex equity issues but found new things in the information on the gifted, handicapped, and men in science. She expressed a need for more role models on the college faculty.

A media student said, "My report on picture books brought out a lot of discussion. I realized I had done it from a woman's point of view. Providing education is developing 'potential.' Teachers can't downgrade 50% of the kids. Sex equity's very important."

Using Units 1, 2, and 3

Jerry Felz was the instructor. The 32 students were enrolled in Introduction to the Study of Education and Educational Psychology. The combined class arrangement facilitated field experiences where observations extended from elementary school to flight attendant training. The NSTEP materials arrived six weeks after the class had begun. Any student input was stricly on a volunteer basis.

When asked for a show of hands as to who had read the sex equity materials only 10 hands went up. When asked about the strengths and weaknesses of the materials, several females said they were "too brief," particularly the history module. The responses very quickly turned to personal experience, and that to something of a battle of the sexes, involving no more than a quarter of the students.

A man, struggling with his decision to be an elementary school teacher--his father was a corporate executive--wanted to have more discussion of males in a female occupation.

And it went: Male: "I don't need to be cuddled like women do." Female: "Why can't you need me as much as I need you." Male: "It's innate for women to want cuddling."

And: Male: "A woman should be a little bit submissive. It's natural." Female: "...nothing natural in submission."

And: Male: "Some women are too radical. Feminism denies certain other things." Female: "Feminism is the theory that women have equal economic, political and social power. We don't have it now and until we do a woman will never win the presidency."

And: Female: "Our radical stand brought change in my high school. Female: "In my high school women's sports were not announced. When the girls won it was put in a flyer but when the boys won it was on TV and in the newspaper." Female: " The women's games were at 2:00 on Tuesday and the boys' were on Friday and Saturday nights. We asked for the same time as the boys'." Male: "Girls' basketball in Iowa--people go to see the games." Female: "There's an implication if they're good they'll get crowds, but money makes the difference. Now there's money for women's athletic scholarships. If as much money is put into women's sports as men's it will be good." Male: "If a woman does a good job I'll recognize her for it." Female: "That's like saying some Jews are good."

This session continued with little reference to NSTEP materials. Jerry had turned the class over to the evaluator to ask the students what she wanted to know, but the responses continued to be personal in nature. Later those interviewees chosen from the students who had read the materials refused to be interviewed, so volunteers who had not read the materials were interviewed. Logs were also unavailable.

Jerry found the Kerber material the most interesting and readable, needing perhaps some "beefing up" to satisfy the academicians. He thought Bornstein's "okay" but "she came on like Buck Rogers" (too aggressively), well written but emphasizing things that made men in the class feel apart from it. As for Gall and Gall, he found the data selection good for bringing out little known aspects of sexism in education.

Using Unit 4

In some places it was more a Battle Within the Sexes--for example in Eveleen Lorton's class, with a high percentage of physical education students. "With Title IX these past couple of years there has been almost open hostility between the two groups of women." Eveleen added, "But the same was true for the men. We had some really open fellows and some dyed-in-the-wool jocks."

Eveleen had handed out the booklets, Between Teacher and Student, the second or third class session. A female majoring in Athletic Training and Physical Education said, "I read it cover to cover. I agreed with it. I wasn't aware of it, but so many times while I was reading it a light went on, and I said, 'Yeah. Yeah, that's what happens.' I couldn't have said it in words but I went back to my high school experience. Many times I caught myself. I wasn't looking for it but now that I'm aware of it, I heard it, and it was just like a slap across the face. I heard it, and it was just like a screech. I was very glad that I had the opportunity to read it. Next semester I'll be student-teaching and I know I'll have that as top priority, something I want to conquer. I'll work on it.

She went on, "I'm in an extra credit class on human sexuality, reading the Kinzey study. He showed the graph about homosexuality and heterosexuality. The line cut through the woman's head and not the man's head. It went diagonally across and it just happened to cut through the woman's head and not the man's head. They could have done it differently so neither would be cut. It looked like there was more female homosexuality going on."

"The module? Easy reading, spelled out very clearly. In fact almost a little monotonous, but that was good. I have nothing bad to say about them. The studies were a variety. ...read materials, had read outside materials and wrote summaries on those and discussed them in class."

"I got extra credit for the log. I would have done it anyhow because it was interesting. Didn't turn it down though. Don't get me wrong. In the final exam there were a couple of questions on that. Throughout the course we related our classroom instances to sex equity. This was a little extra thrown in and some got more out of it than others. Some in the class weren't too interested. Maybe they just didn't understand it. Most seemed to be involved in it. There was another girl in the class who thought, 'What is she talking about?' I was really fired up about it. I think I'll be confronted with it in P.E. I had to work coed in P.E. I realize I was sexist when I taught before, and picked on certain people. Now I'd love to go back and try it again. I'd keep a little log on that experience. Before I was having gentlemen setting up nets. Now I'd get women involved that way. No more girls in front and boys in back. I'd modify the rules if need be for boys and girls to play together.

"How important? Very important. Every person is an individual. When someone comes and slaps you across the face, you know. No one likes to be put down. I'm going into athletics. There it's getting to be okay for girls, but you don't go into football. It hasn't affected me. In high school I went through a lot of guff. Other girls wore the make-up. I said, 'I don't care.' I didn't have a lot of friends in school and that was hard on me, but I knew what I wanted so it didn't bother me."

The logs from Eveleen's class were somehow, somewhere misplaced and were not available for this evaluation report.

NEW YORK CITY

New York City is New York City. Along toward the Hudson River, "uptown Manhattan, on 112th Street, Driver," is Bank Street College. No greensward Quad to enter, rather, you sign in at the door. It's a graduate college of education and a children's school. Students at Bank Street College share the place with the children. If you get off at the right floor you see the threes scrubbing their babies, the eights making Eskimo prints or the fives building bridges with blocks. It's a rah-rah place too, but startlingly, the enthusiasm is EDUCATION.

Using Unit 3

Peggy Cole administered the NSTEP pretest and posttest attitude scales in her Child Development course in fall term, but did not assign the materials. She did with her second semester course. Three students volunteered to read them. The evaluation visit occured during the first semester.

Fifteen women and one man met at 4:30 for the two hour weekly session. The day's discussion centered on feelings of children the first day of school. Peggy asked the students to think of their own experiences and to relate those to children's experiences in classrooms where they teach. The discussion moved to how boys form groups and how girls form groups from a developmental point of view.

In describing the course later, Peggy said, "The essence of training at Bank Street is to teach teachers (1) the meaning of children's behavior, (2) the factors which contribute to behavior, and (3) how behavior changes as a function of age -- and therefore to plan classroom experiences which help each individual develop social and cognitive skills and a sense of self-worth."

"The issue of sexuality is approached the way I approach everything at Bank Street--from a developmental point of view. I ask 'How do children develop a sense of self, how does it change, what phenomena are age-related?' Sex related behaviors are looked at, not in isolation, but in totality."

Peggy answered several interview questions off-handedly, expressing her reservations about the NSTEP materials. "There's a danger in the whole rationalistic attempt to change the world. From research the NSTEP authors have culled isolated pieces of information. They keep repeating over and over that girls are equal to boys. They draw heavily from social learning theory. Some of the deeper theories of human behavior are not in there: Freud, Erikson, Kohlberg, Piaget,... There is a total lack of anthropology. The issue of knowing who one is is deeper than playing with sexually stereotyped toys. Ignored are biologically-related behaviors such as what it means for females to carry young and what is nurturing. Cultures are responses to the needs of people. You can't turn them around without a major revolution. Inflation and birth control have a lot more to do with women's roles than the feminist movement. A lot more!"

The students were highly supportive of the Bank Street approach. One woman from Haiti said, "In Haiti it's highly structured. Boys do what men are supposed to do and girls what women do. I was very surprised to see that the head of Bank Street School was a woman. I love it here because we learn a lot of things applicable in the classroom. They ask you questions in the way they expect you to ask the children... You can take the model and apply it."

Another student who teaches threes said, "I don't differentiate at all. We have blocks and trucks as well as creative materials. I did notice that in order for the girls to use the blocks I had to be physically in the corner. I think it was because some of the boys were rough. I don't know where it comes from."

Using Units 1 and 2

On December 12, 4 men and 14 women gathered 'round a table for an evening seminar in Ruby Takanishi's Principles and Problems of Early Childhood and Elementary Education. In September she had offered them two booklets, Sexism in American Education and Woman's Place in the Schools as resource materials. Most had taken copies. So far the materials had not been discussed in class, nor were they on this occasion.

Discussion began with the children's 'real life' environment, how to bring it into the curriculum, for example, how to increase their ability to use public transportation. It took a historical turn, noting how social, political and economic changes influence textbooks. Ruby asked, "Why haven't we talked about sex equity and race relations?" A female student said it was difficult to raise the question when raising it might make things worse. Another said it could mean that we want to avoid the issues. And another said it might be more a personal thing, not the responsibility of Education. A male student said he thought there was a place for teachers to deal with such issues, but there also were limits.

The abiding connection with controversy was noted. One student remembered a teacher ripping out a section on childbirth before distributing a textbook. Others talked of values, remarking of dress codes and teenage pregnancies. A lively exchange over the selection of teachers followed--low salary, low prestige were attributed to teaching being seen as a woman's profession. A male said, "Teaching definitely is a profession with an inferiority complex. It's a paradox that America values education highly, yet salaries are low." A female commented on status going with student age. Ruby cited a study showing that the younger the children taught, the lower the status and pay--and the fewer men in it. After a few comments on roles of fathers, and men in general, the discussion moved to the importance of early learning and studies by Piaget.

Later Ruby told the interviewer that Dewey was the major figure in the course. She also mentioned Montessori and several who had helped shape Bank Street: Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Carolyn Pratt, and Harriet Johnson. She said she highly recommended to the students the book by Sarah Lawrence Lightfoot, Worlds Apart, for its history of women with an emphasis on education.

"The students know I feel the status of women is related to early childhood programs. When women are needed in the work force, such as in wartime, there is provision for child care. When women are no longer needed, they are expected to return to their homes."

Ruby expressed reservation about "the history" in Kerber's booklet. She withheld recommendation of the Bornstein and Kerber materials for Bank Street but saw them as potentially useful where materials are used in a more traditional way, adding she did not use 'traditional' perjoratively. And "My sense is that sexism is an emotional issue with political ramifications. I think this piece (Bornstein's) avoids the emotional aspects of sexist behaviors. And I don't think informational input changes people's behavior significantly."

Among the students there was little talk of issues raised by Bornstein or Kerber, but some about the relative influences of home and school. One young woman said, "Whatever a boy or girl wants to be they get from home before they ever get to school. They're going to do what they want to no matter how you arrange for it." A young man: I don't think school is completely hopeless. She replied, "I'm talking about older children."

Using Unit 4

Harriet Cuffaro, a member of the Bank Street Graduate faculty, taught a course in Curriculum of Early Childhood Education. After administering the NSTEP field-trial pretest, she gave out the Sadker & Sadker booklets, indicating they were supplementary, not required reading. Later in December, of the 26 students 5 said they had read it, 11 had "skimmed" it.

In interview Harriet said: "I make the assumption that there is a lot of stereotypic behavior in classrooms. Therefore, I talk to them about many of our materials which are loaded with those expectations. For example, blocks are seen as a boy's material. We have to ask 'Why?' And why painting is seen as a girl's activity. We'll talk about societal values and expectations and about what can be done in an educationally sound way to counter expectations."

"Parents may want those societal values. They may not want their son painting. They may not want their daughter building. At the same time, parents want the best for their children. By best I mean the fullest opportunity to be themselves, to have opportunities to learn. Discussion about materials has to become 'a learning thing.' We need to talk to parents about what is best for the child in terms of enlarging options for learning."

"This NSTEP unit deals with attitudes. The students said it was interesting. I think there is a lot of redundancy in it. It became boring. If the function is to raise consciousness, I don't think it does that well. And it came on very strong in relation to teachers as though all the burden of society is on teachers. The role of the parents is underplayed.

"A lot of the material dealt with upper elementary and secondary teaching and many of those situations are not particularly relevant for early childhood." Harriet mentioned that all attempts to erect a sex fair environment for early childhood may not be educationally sound. For example, some educators and psychologists have recommended that since housekeeping is seen as a female domain and block play a male domain, you should combine the two. That makes little sense educationally. In the housekeeping area you are dealing with a scale of direct participation. In block building you move to symbolic representation, a different scale. By combining the two you cause confusion. It neglects what the learning is all about. We try to look at housekeeping and see why the girls are always there and why the boys are in the block area. (A student commented in her interview that the boys playing house resented getting sent off to work by the girls (mommies), thus being denied the fun of the place as daddies.)

Harriet went on to stress that it was not enough to make students more aware of sex discrimination. What the students needed was help in developing sound ideas of curriculum and teaching activities. "If it's sound educationally, more than likely it will be non-sexist."

"Being a participant," Harriet said, "raised questions for me. I am diametrically opposed to the Sadker's style and method. I think you should not handle sex equity as a special unit. We are dealing with identity, lifelong feelings, attitudes, and experience...Yet an interesting thing is happening. Although I am not using the units as proposed, being a participant keeps the topic up front for me. This is true even though the topic has not been discussed in class at length in an isolated manner. It could be they (the students) all agree, or lack interest, or it is not a burning issue, or that the size of the class and room arrangement did not facilitate discussion. I don't know why." At the end of the term student term-papers came in. Two were on non-sexist curricula, with "maybe more papers to come."

Greeley lies on that great swell of prairie rushing east from the foothills, from the Rockies themselves. It is a place of cattle and sugarbeets and small grain, where ranchers live more or less in their pickups and watch themselves and their history on TV's version of Michener's Centennial. The University, formerly a Teachers College whose summer program was especially popular, has recently been embarrassed by charges of "low quality" doctorates in education. In its basic classes in preservice teacher education, however, the professional dedication and content of courses was more than respectable, and much like what these evaluators have found elsewhere in the United States.

Using Units 1 and 2

A student interviewee, a teacher's aide in an all-Black school before coming to Northern Colorado, said: "I thought that the main strength of this (Bornstein) is that they discussed male discrimination that we practice in elementary schools. As a female, I'm very aware of discrimination toward women, but not towards men. It made me think, 'Now, wait a minute. When I was a teacher, did I do any of those things?' Since coming here, I began to question whether other women are aware of sex discrimination. There are women who really don't believe it. When I gave them examples they went, 'Really?' ... Another thing, they (Bornstein) tell you what stereotyping is--so you can recognize it. It's always been so vague, but this tells you about it, and the statistics to back it up."

As to improving the text, she suggested that the misinformation about Title IX should follow rather than precede its description. She liked the discussion of vocational education, would like more on discrimination in textbooks.

She said, "For me Kerber was fascinating. First of all I enjoy History and it gave me statistics to back up my own thoughts. In 1903 women weren't allowed to vote, or even to speak at an NEA meeting. It was hard for me to imagine that prejudice like that exists. ... The year I was born Blacks were not allowed in Southern colleges. To me that was shocking. I loved the inserts because it wasn't secondhand."

A male student said, "In class I did a lot of gadflying. It gave me an opportunity to see how I perceived sexism. For me a lot of this is self-evident. I'd like to see it continued a little bit deeper for people who have already encountered it."

These were some of the students in Mike Jacobs' Foundation of Education course. Mike is Chairman of that department. He met with around 50 students 1 hour 4 days a week and spent a week on the NSTEP materials. One discussion started with question 1 and 6, Does sexism exist? and How do curriculum materials affect it? One young woman said she thought it okay for girls to play kick soccer but not for boys to jump rope. They went on through a stream of topics, including possible achievement costs in sex equity, the protection that comes from sex roles, what the laws should be, and androgeny.

Mike later said he felt good about their responses. He said, "There were a couple people who wouldn't say 'boo' all year that were coming up with arguments." He said about the class discussion that there was little coming from the materials, that they were responding to themselves, their personal experiences.

He said, "The Bornstein piece is extremely powerful. Not only as a well-documented resource but powerful in initiating inquiry. I would cover Title IX in passing, but I can use Bornstein now to get into the educational consequences of Title IX. I can emphasize their role and responsibility as teachers." He indicated that two of his colleagues were "very happy with it too." And he indicated he would prefer to use Kerber's piece as resource, on library reserve, for various topics. "My colleagues don't know what to do with it."

Using Unit 3

"We have ten people teaching educational psychology," said Kyle Carter. "I showed the material to two. There was no great reaction, no great interest. I think the reason is that people in my department are as aware of sex equity as I. They really haven't thought about the need to teach a sex equity course. I think the instructors need a little education as to what they might be doing. Most people don't see the need for it yet, because they themselves are not even aware."

Kyle's story about introducing the topic into his course, Developmental Psychology for Education indicated that while he was excited at first about teaching the topic, he became less. At the Orientation session he found that there was going to be little help from the NSTEP Project--other than what was in the instructor's manual--as to how to handle it. The message at that September session seemed to be to do whatever makes sense. Then, about when it came time to teach it, the field trial evaluator rescheduled her visit, and--trying to be as helpful as possible--Kyle withdrew it from the Personal and Social Development portion of the course, to teach it when the evaluator could observe. Snowstorms interfered with the schedule too, so what had been expected as a week at one point in the course became a day much later.

Probably most distressing to Kyle was the quality of the instructor's manual. "It appeared to be something they remembered they had to do. It appears they did it very quickly. For instance, the true-false test. You don't get a good picture of someone's understanding with those kinds of items. There is no mention of films, etc. that could go along." Kyle also felt students needed more of the background and procedures of the studies presented. Perhaps in the student booklets. He added that his overall feeling about recommending the module depended on improvements in the instructor's manual. "Most of my colleagues would be about as aware of the (sex equity) research as I was. If the instructor's manual provided some good ways of presenting the topics, I could recommend the materials."

His assignment to students was to read Boys and Girls in School: A Psychological Perspective, to write down the impact the materials had on you, and be prepared to discuss questions, including those about your personal feelings. Also, the worldwide disaster exercise with its 11 discussion questions (manual, p. 17) was distributed to the class, with the requirement that each student would select one question and write an answer to it. (The evaluators hold the answer papers the students turned in.) In class, the students met in groups to discuss the aftermath of such a disaster. A student in one small group said that hard labor would have to be done by men, so there would have to be a sex-based division of labor. A female said that females' control of their lives was dependent on birth control.

After a while they reassembled as one group to react to the NSTEP materials. One complaint: too redundant. Another: poor arrangement and readability of the bar graph. A woman said, "...some of it common knowledge, but others shocked me." Another: "...30% of students believed a woman's place is in the home. I couldn't believe it." To which a classmate said, "That's not so surprising. My boyfriend's family hates it that I'm career-oriented..." The discussion continued (as in so many other sites) with increased attention to the students own experiences and feelings.

Kyle later reflected, "It (sex-based inequities) is a topic that has been of no great concern other than the effect on adults. As to elementary children we know it happens but we don't know how. It hasn't hit very many people yet as to how it happens with children."

OREGON

An imperceptible rain connects dull skies and shiny streets. People are busy, but there's a sense of tranquility as one strolls past stone and brick buildings on the leaf covered walks. Time for talk in the Education Building.

Using Unit 2

I. Toby Edson's "History of American Education" course the assignment for Paper #3 read: "Please write a critical review of Linda Kerber's 'Woman's Place is in the School.' Your review should not merely summarize or report what the author said; rather, it should reflect your thoughts about the material, supported, whenever possible, with specific evidence. In writing your essay you might consider the following: the author's thesis, her use of evidence, her assumptions, and how people such as Carr, Bailyn, Cubberley, Demos, Tyack, Mann, and Edson might respond to her piece. This one page review is due November 15, 1979." (The Kerber booklet had been distributed a week earlier without discussion).

When class met the next time only 24 of the 50 students were present. The discussion of the Kerber booklet was almost exclusively negative. Comments ranged from criticism of the use of pronouns and undocumented enumerations to inadequate context for considering the functions of the school and the resulting conflicts of power and value--positions. Finally, one woman ventured, "I'd like to say one positive thing. The excerpts made it come alive." Other comments were:

"I was upset by the title. Wasn't it sarcastic?"

"Her thesis was the traditional Cubberley thesis, where things get better and better."

"Many women were mentioned but there was no critical insight. If women helped in education they must also be responsible for the limitations."

All 50 students handed in their reviews that day. One student wrote: "In 57 pages of text (not counting the 15 pages of primary sources generally inserted without comment or critical examination) there are references to 67 women and 13 men. Dewey, Mann, Booker T. Washington and Froebel are briefly mentioned, while the remaining males are almost all cited for their sexist attitudes, without any discussion of whether their views were general. Only one woman, Catherine Beecher receives a critical word: 'she was critical of women's rights' (p. 35), but we are not told why she took this position or how commonly this opinion was shared by other women. Instead we are told, 'The spirit of liberty spread where it was not intended.' This comment illustrates the tone prevailing throughout this pseudo-history. Historical methodology is replaced by propaganda."

Another student wrote: "There is merit in how Kerber uses excerpts of speeches, diaries, journals, letters, records, newsletters and books. She also sparks interest in the material by raising questions that she does not answer, thus causing the reader to think beyond what Kerber is discussing."

Toby said he discusses the history of women in education as a matter of practice. For example, he addresses such topics as the feminization of teaching in the mid-nineteenth century, how educational scientists such as Hall and Thorndike justified differential education for women, and how urbanization and industrialization caused changes in men's and women's social and work roles and, in turn, resulted in changing conceptions of women's education. Later Toby summarized his own dismay: "I was absolutely amazed and shocked that this was ever put into print for a history of education class. I was also very disturbed by the review process. Specialists in educational history would have been very helpful at an earlier review stage."

A male student told the interviewer, "Since she does quote (contemporary scholars) like Tyack, the author needs to point out that there are other current histories that reflect more accurately women's contribution to education." A woman said, "You get the impression from her book that inequities in schooling and employment result from sexist, narrow-minded, male domination of the system of public schooling. I think she has to get away from that." And another man said, "In Oregon, to get a teaching certificate or to be a school administrator, you have to know the meaning of Title IX and some other legislation. I have problems with that being the solution. It may raise more antagonism and may 'shallow' the effort. I don't know if forcing people to take a test will make them support democratic ideals."

Using Unit 3

Janet Moursand had her 100 Educational Psychology students gathered into 4 discussion groups prior to reading the sex equity material. By chance each group had about 20% males. Probably not by chance, each group selected a male as spokesperson. "That demonstration," Janet said, "will, I suspect, stick with the students long after they've forgotten the module."

The instruction in this large class was usually a lecture, with some discussion. But on one occasion, with Joy Gall present as a specialist on sex equity research, Janet said, "Open for free-for-all. Comments? Questions?" First there was talk of Title IX. Janet pointed out that Title IX requires those who receive federal funds to provide equal opportunity for girls. Then, drawing attention more to the NSTEP materials she said, "We have an author here to fight with."

A male student wondered why the downplay of research on infants. Joy responded that because of inadequate research controls it was impossible to tease apart the social and biological influences. This led to some discussion of brain lateralization and on to how men suffer discrimination. A male said, "How am I being hurt?" "The draft," was one answer.

After more discussion on child development and parents exchanging roles another male student asked, "Aren't we trying to push too far?" Gradually more people were getting involved in the discussion, but the class period soon ended.

Later when the students were interviewed, one said, "Yes, I think some of the students did experience a special moment of insight." Another said, "It changed a lot of my opinions. Quite a bit. If people in my home town had read some of this stuff they would have thrown it out. You might call them rednecks, or whatever." And another, "...a lot of the discussions we have about this (sex role stereotyping) are same sex discussions. I liked this class because you heard what the men have to say."

A female said, "I had thought the pronouns unimportant until I read Howard Gardner's child psychology cases, written with the female pronouns. I suddenly realized it was 'she' and I identified with it, I read she and thought 'that could be me.'"

About the materials one student said, "...you get confused about which stereotype belongs to which section and which biological difference belongs to which section." And another said, "Yeah, we males were really getting it about social values. Don't know about that. Kinda scratch the old head."

Janet was not pleased with the organization of the project. She said a week was too long and thought the materials were better suited to elementary than secondary. She was dissapointed with the orientation session. Janet said the developers had promised to present ways to use the materials but they did not. (The orientation had stressed that it was important for instructors to use them as they saw best.) She also objected to the evaluation (too redundant, for one thing). But she concluded that the materials were excellent, their organization outstanding. She said she would use them again.

Using Units 4 and 5

Terry Bullock and Meredith Gall combined their classes to form Block II in the teacher education sequence. Their enrollment this term is 10. The students get credit for Reading and Writing in the Secondary School and for Teaching Strategies. They have chosen not to use the module Meredith helped author for Ed Psych students. Rather they have distributed the one by the Sadkers, Between Teacher and Student, and the one by Gollnick and the Sadkers, Beyond the Dick and Jane Syndrome. Today's guest is Joy Gall, co-author of the Ed Psych module. After the small group discussions described below she presented some research she and Meredith had done on sex equity.

This is the day the whole 2 1/2 hours are devoted to sex equity, though certain of the issues have come up before. To get started they divide the class into two groups to discuss sex equity in the school. The students were to imagine that their school had just received $5000 to be used for sex equity purposes. Three options were suggested: (1) Replace sexist textbooks, (2) Create a special program for mathematically talented girls, or (3) Hold a workshop on Teacher Stereotypes and Expectations.

After discussions one group decided to approach the hypothetical classroom teachers to discuss sex equity and other problems with them, to set up a project, perhaps an observer, to help teachers deal with some of those problems, and to consciously work at overcoming stereotypic expectations while doing the work of the project. (One student, having heard about the NSTEP material in Educational Psychology class, would have liked more discussion of the topic.)

A student commented: "In general we did not use the materials very directly. Some were concerned about the materials being slanted. As used, the materials were not particularly illuminating or responsible for any great changes in people's opinions."

Another student: "I think they are very important materials. They have something to say about the upcoming change in values and women taking more positive roles in society and being more productive. They definitely reflect today and what's going on."

Terry Bullock was enthusiastic about the course combination, about this group of students, and about the two NSTEP modules. He said, "I'm definitely going to use those materials in the future." He especially liked some of the case studies toward the end of the Dick and Jane Syndrome. He thought that Between Teacher and Student could be condensed. He suggested that videotapes might be produced to demonstrate some of the points in a classroom setting. In future courses Terry and Meredith would like to deal with sex equity when students are observing in classrooms and were planning to have students observe such things as "who gets air time?" and who the teacher calls on.

SAN FRANCISCO

Herb Caen, San Francisco Chronicle columnist, calls it Baghdad by the Bay. Sun-baked, teeming, political, eastern is this California city, and especially its largest university, San Francisco State. Scruffy men sell hand-wrought silver, but vending machines sell milk and apples. The walkways crowd with pinks, yellows and browns, but casual clothes and portable typewriters dismiss the picture of Arabian Nights. It is a commuter school, and its education students are well traveled and blasé about encounters with the oldest and youngest of cultures.

Using Unit 4

Early in October Jim Bixler asked his elementary school curriculum students to participate in the NSTEP project on a voluntary basis. He expected that quite a few would read Between Teacher and Student: Overcoming Sex Bias in the Classroom and that some would select sexism as a topic for their mini-units when they worked with children in November. The response exceeded his expectations.

First scheduled was the WEEA film, Changing Images: Confronting Career Stereotypes. Discussion followed, with students making reference to concepts read in the booklets: self-fulfilling prophecy, stereotyping, Pygmalian effect, Pick-a-Pattern: Disciplinary, Active Teaching, or Evaluation. They answered the pattern questions on pages 42-47. Jim asked them to apply these teacher stereotypes (patterns) to their own teaching, using audio recorder, a teacher or another working in the room to help observe and analyze.

Another WEEA film was shown, Sex Stereotyping in the Schools. More discussion followed. Jim Bixler's comment later about the discussion: "I felt concerned about the low level of insight our teacher trainees have regarding sex socialization.... This group recognizes sex bias (in language usage)...and (many) say, 'Oh, it doesn't make any difference.' A couple years ago (the students) were upset, vocal. That may come again."

A student working in a Day Care Center expressed appreciation of the study of sex equity: "We've been able to use it for examining our own stereotypes, the ways we act with children. As they say in the book, 'It's subconscious. You don't actually know how you're behaving.' It's given me more insight into how I act with children."

An interviewee calling herself a Feminist said: "The materials are strong in that readers are forced to examine themselves. They bring out a good many ways that we oppress boys and girls. I do not find the materials good for people who do not have a consciousness. They are still a little too gentle. I heard some incredibly sexist comments in our classroom, for example: 'It's physiological. Girls don't have muscles. Of course they don't want to run and play.' Can you believe that from a teacher?"

A student in class reported one man talked about the ways boys are socialized to be very active, assertive and possibly aggressive in our society; that our traditional classrooms totally repress (those behaviors). He was interested in providing a more structured way of allowing the assertiveness to come out (in ways that would not disrupt) the classroom. A woman student responded by saying that boys should be quiet and polite in the classroom.

About the effect on his students Jim said, "I think the students have more precision in recognizing teacher behavior that impacts on kids and an ability to state more precisely what the research in sex bias shows.... I find the materials useful and recommend them. It's a nice concise summary of the area."

Using Unit 4

"All of us are multicultural," Thomassine Sellers told her elementary education students. Each of us belongs to different cultures, groups based on age, ethnic membership, and sex. Each of our cultural groups has expectations for us." She asked the class to identify different groups influencing each of them.

It was apparent to her students that they were to share their experiences since last meeting, interpreting them in terms of their learning about teaching. On this occasion they discussed a "Sixty Minutes" program on Reading where 9-year-old children were reading Emerson and parents said they had to take the books away or their children would read all the time. The students attributed some of that to "expectations." Tommie Sellers spoke of "significant others" influencing the child and that expectations sometimes are limiting, sometimes challenging.

Meeting jointly--as was the case at some other NSTEP field trial sites--Dr. Sellers' students were enrolled in Analyzing Child Behavior in the School Setting and also in Curriculum in the Elementary School. The students were familiar with multicultural artifacts, and in that very group were those of Japanese, Chinese, Black, Russian, Italian, Jewish, Portugese and German extraction. Tommie Sellers felt that students at San Francisco State came with understandings of sexism as well. Noting that it was not uncommon there to see a woman in a construction hat, she said that the NSTEP unit helped these students crystalize the information they already had. "Myra and David's (Sadker) unit is a real teaching unit," she said. "Their units are beautiful. I get no negative reaction to the subject."

One student working with preschool children said, "I was aware of sexism in books and materials, girls not playing with trucks and that sort of thing, but I wasn't aware of teacher behavior toward the sexes." Another student said, "It was interesting. I had a lot of homework but I read this. The situations made it more real than research reports do. You can put yourself in the position of the teacher."

At other NSTEP field sites some students remarked about how "strident" the materials were. Not at San Francisco State. There were requests for more information such as on the physical and biological differences in boys and girls.

Students in Tommie Sellers' class did not register large gains on the NSTEP attitude scales, partly because they had discussed sexism in class before the pretesting. It also should be noted that those students were unhappy with the forced choices of the attitude scale. These students had considerable familiarity with the topic of sex equity before the NSTEP study, therefore the questionnaire was not sophisticated enough to pick up gains in understandings and knowledge. The students discussed the NSTEP materials off and on throughout the semester. The topic re-emerged frequently, for example, as they considered humanism, behaviorism, mainstreaming, and of course, multiculturalism.

Using Units 4 and 5

According to Ray Roberts, "students working toward a teaching credential at San Francisco State have an opportunity to hear a presentation by instructors of each of the sections in which they might enroll, and to visit personally with them, before choosing with whom they will study during their credentialling program."

"The reason I mention it is not only because I am proud of the system but because, during that orientation meeting, I hit pretty hard in expressing my belief in nonsexist education. I wouldn't be surprised if it brought me a pretty select group--even of SFS students. As my own awareness grows, I hit harder and harder--and the fewer males I get in my classes."

At nine in the morning, his classroom was warm and inviting, with students serving bagels and cream cheese, honeydew melon and coffee. Other students were preparing to make the presentation, a team presentation on sex-bias based on the Sadker booklet. By ten the students had heard that first presentation and had been assigned some reading in the booklet. A second group presented a video-tape of a teacher with her class. The presenters analyzed it in terms of expectations and roles. They distributed the booklet, Between Teacher and Student. By noon the class had had a third presentation based on Bornstein's writing on famous women. The students took her test as part of the presentation, and acknowledged the fact that they did not do well on it.

Later Ray commented (to the evaluator) on the NSTEP project and how his class was profiting from it. "It's an excellent vehicle for teaching about prejudice and limitations, role limitations in our society. I don't see myself teaching about sexism but about prejudice. Whether it's short people or people with grey hair, long noses or black skin, when you limit someone by your expectations you pass that message on. This material has been a delightful addition to the teaching profession's bag of tricks."

The students interviewed also were supportive, especially of Bornstein's work, but expressed reservation too. One said, "I think sex equality is important enough to make students aware. I don't know if it's important enough that I would have them say mail carrier rather than mailman or police officer rather than policeman, etc. I don't want the kids to think it's libby type stuff. It's humanities. It's being aware of human potential and the things that are going to happen to a male or female--not just female." The students found some of the things they observed in their research did not fit into the categories, also saying that some of the examples given were too elementary for college level studies.

WESTERN MICHIGAN

Kalamazoo lies halfway between Detroit and Chicago, but far enough from both to be very different. A regional commerical center, it is the home of Western Michigan University which also serves the counties that edge the eastern shore of Lake Michigan. Most students go there with a rural orientation and remain loyal to their heritage. A new campus and a cosmopolitan discourse obscure the old teachers college. Pearl Bailey talks about her books, Hurry Up America Spit for the adults and Duey's Tale for children. Urbanites and foreign students enrich the campus, yet remain apart from those whose roots are deep in the soil.

Using Unit 4

Logs and interviews from the four students in Mary Cain's class revealed a great interest in combating sexism. They saw it in evidence not only in school but in all aspects of their own lives. They saw themselves as trying to change, trying to be more accepting of all people, allowing all children to develop their full potential intellectually and emotionally.

One female student told Mary, "I had a math lesson which simply flopped. The class collapsed into mass hysteria and two boys lost their recess. Now, before reading the Sadker's material I would never have dreamed that I could be biased, pro or con, about one student or another. But I am. See, I took recess away from boys, never girls. And in others around me. Men and women say things about their careers and I can sense the way their education has affected them. This weekend my Dad's girlfriend said she really hated working and would rather just get married. Jesus, can you hear a man saying that--ever?"

For an elementary math unit she was illustrating, a student showed a girl playing football, another nailing at the walls of a club house. When her pupils reacted, she used their responses for a creative writing assignment.

Mary Cain had many ideas and resource materials to help students in her student teaching seminar work toward a sex fair classroom. Not the least this term was Module 4, Between Student and Teacher. Mary said, "But I turn their attention to themselves. For example, I asked them what they thought of Kogan's old data on the stability of dependence. They thought it true, but that they had been trained to be dependent. They shared their fears of assertion. All but one (who was pleased already with her independence) said they would like to be less dependent."

One student said, "...the module made me notice I helped girls open milk cartons more than boys." Discussions about sex equity continued on and on, perhaps because Mary's students were out in the classrooms. They were able to look at themselves in terms of their own behavior as teachers.

Mary said she gets a little negative reaction to the topic now. But in 1961 she got a furious reaction. So we tried lots of things, group supportive things, accepting feelings as they were. We kept presenting data. The data save us. It's irrefutable. You can read it anywhere. Sometimes I use a special list of books written by men. The men who read them don't all become feminists, but they change. Knowledge makes us change."

Mary thought the module was good. She emphasized that the "kids" liked it. She and the students felt the critical incidents were realistic. They were startled by some of the research reports. The difficulty level was appropriate. She said, "The students were interested which means the books work."

Using Unit 1

Mike Howard's students registered for Historical, Social, and Philosophical Perspectives on Education for Young Children but he called it "Children and Institutions."

Seventeen women and one man sat at tables arranged in an open-ended oval. He told them that the sex equity materials would be integrated into the larger question, "How schools work and how you change them." Previously they had discussed administrative changes. Now attention shifted to the courts.

Mike put a triangle on the board to illustrate (1) rules, (2) habits/traditions, and how they effect (3) self concepts. For example in Louisiana the rule was "You can't sit on this part of the train, you're 1/8 colored blood." Mike said the person riding appealed. "Anyone know the case? A Black woman tried to think of the separate but equal decision of Plessy vs. Ferguson. Mike helped out, and continued by telling about Blacks who petitioned their school in Summerton, South Carolina for toilets, running water, textbooks, etc. A student responded, "Minor details!" With Brown vs. Board of Education, Mike said 'How you feel' became important and set the stage for a decade of attention to equality--sex, race, handicapped, age, status, sexual preference.... The discussion following emphasized the role of expectations, with one Black woman telling how she was counseled not to attend college because she wasn't "college material."

Mike asked them to turn to page 6 of Bornstein, to the Questionnaire on Women and said, "What do you think of the first one?" "Male chauvinist pig," a woman replied. They went on, personalistic and good naturedly, commenting on religion and sexism. Mike turned the discussion to Emma and Title IX, parts of their reading assignment in Bornstein's Sexism in American Education. In the discussion of sports a student said, "We're back to separate but equal."

Mike also used the Inner City Simulation Model developed by Cruikshank. "Not only do they demonstrate racism and classism but sexism too, for the passages are as sexist as the culture."

After the attention to the judicial system the class was to take up legislative changes. Mike felt that Bornstein would fit in well there too. He suggested that an exercise be added for writing up a complaint on Title IX.

In interview some students spoke about their lack of awareness of sex equity issues. "I've never heard any discussion on sex equity at home. I never felt discriminated against. I don't know if the ERA has passed in Michigan." Others, more aware, cited cases from their own experience of discrimination against both men and women.

Mike Howard related the issue of sex equity to racial equity more than any instructor with the exception of two at Florida A&M.

Using Unit 1

Norma Hungerford taught Education 450, School and Society, which met from 3 to 5 each Wednesday. She assigned the Bornstein materials early in the semester.

One Wednesday Norma asked her students to think of instances when, because of their particular sex, they had been "encouraged to, pressured to, encouraged not to, or pressured not to" participate in particular activities, courses, etc. in school. The class was divided into groups.

One discussion began with a male student telling how he, shy and passive, was sent to the principal and encouraged to take part in sports. Another male had wanted to cook and sew but was told it was too feminine. Women students talked of being forced to wear dresses and forbidden to take woodworking. One recalled playing the trumpet, being told, "You're good for a girl."

The activity (instructors guide p. 5) on male and female characteristics was modified to begin another discussion. Students numbered from 1-26 were given the two adjectives on each line and told to identify whether society attributed the characteristic more to males or females, then to say which adjective was generally seen to be characteristic of the healthy adult. The clinical results of the Bronerman study were then presented.

Norma wrote in her log: "The students all agreed that the exercise stimulated discussion and made them look at their own assumptions and at their roles as prospective teachers." Commenting on the whole unit she said, "Stimulating. Created much awareness. Thought provoking activities! Overemphasis on sexual equality as just for women. Some examples outdated. Preferably use below junior-senior level. Stimulation of awareness significant in itself."

She also commented, "I felt somewhat frustrated because our unit had to be spread over the entire semester. However, I feel that it set the tone for the whole semester. With the ongoing discussion, the students seemed to enlarge their awareness, apply it to their student teaching classrooms and not be rushed into reading it all at one time. On the last class day quite a few--maybe 10--remarked how much they enjoyed it and how much it added to the course."

A male student said: "Whenever this topic was brought up, the guys in the class would side-up against the girls (mainly for fun). Personally, I strongly support the examples and quizzes in this book."

A female student said, "I think most students were dissatisfied. Some commented that the information and materials were outdated and the idea of sexism overdone. I am left with the impression that class members have already grown past the content of the materials. The boob tube beat the author to it."

A male said, "...they talk about females and minorities as stereotyped, but not males. Do they think we're on top? I don't feel on top."

Another female said, "Doors are opening. I'm afraid of it happening too fast. If it goes too fast our whole society will be abolished. Education would have to change. Families would have to change--or would there be families? I'm fearful for the family. I don't think you should let a career ruin your family."

TALLAHASSEE

This is the seat of Florida government, trading center for a diverse agricultural region (dairy foods, fruits, nuts and lumber) and home of two major state universities. Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University was originally created as a Black counterpart to Florida State University to provide separate but equal education. Now, in some legal sense, each is integrated.

With F.A.M.U. Homecoming on Friday and Saturday, orange and green pompoms and balloons flutter in the breeze. Students stroll along the walks, discussing bands and football. In the Education Building the bulletin board repeats the plea of Martin Luther King, Jr.: "I am convinced that the most significant step that we can take is that short walk to the voting booth."

Using Units 4 and 5

Elinor Ellis, tapping the NSTEP materials said, "I wanted my students to get something out of this. I really worked at it." She estimated she spent ten hours in preparation: photocopying, writing a quiz, researching androgeny theory, planning a student trip to the library for a lecture, preparing activity sheets, arranging student observations in schools.

She estimated the students enrolled in Theory and Practice of Teaching spent six hours in class, perhaps six hours out. They did appear to have read the Sadkers' Between Teacher and Student: Overcoming Sex Bias in the Classroom. They discussed the "Report Card" after small group and library activity. After small group work there were reports (based on the "Report Card," pp. 6-10) on the costs of sex bias. Discussion was free and easy, mentioning instances observed in classrooms, noting how culture determines the options, e.g., girls punished for being rowdy, being dressed in clothes unsuitable for sports. In a 6th grade they saw the teacher helping boys but not girls. In a 2nd grade the teacher knew boys' names, asked girls theirs.

The students also discussed a handout on androgeny which emphasized the opportunity to choose behavior according to a preferred life style rather than according to sex. The men sat in the back of the class, didn't participate as much as the women but when called on, responded with a show of interest. Later one said, "I was thought of as a problem in school because I wasn't aggressive enough." These course activities "opened my eyes. If I have a child, especially a girl, I'll watch to see that she's not forced into something, so she can be what she wants to be."

The students who observed in classrooms seemed to discuss more of the effects of teacher behavior and less their own personal experience than those who read the modules but did not follow up with observations.

Elinor also taught a class in Children's Literature, assigning Beyond the Dick and Jane Syndrome: Confronting Sex Bias in Instructional Materials. From page 8ff, they examined the six forms of bias identified by Gollnick and the Sadkers and discussed how these biases in instructional materials might affect student attitudes. Elinor's presentation was "fired up" and the students responded in kind. No one expressed opposition. Each used the module criteria for evaluating a book. Together they thought of ways to influence publishers.

From NSTEP or anywhere Elinor appealed for more research, more content, more references to films and support materials, and more exercises.

Using Unit 4

When his Dean asked James Byrd to participate in the NSTEP project he acquiesced. He told a colleague he was to attend a meeting in Washington on sexism in education. "What's that?" his colleague said. He replied, "Probably much ado about nothing." They both laughed.

At the orientation meetings he began to feel differently. He thought, "There is something to this after all. My daughter is good in math and I wouldn't want her stifled."

During the fall term his Educational Psychology class spent approximately five hours of class time on the sex equity topic. We estimated that the average student spent 2-3 hours out of class studying the materials. Jim spent about the same amount of time in his preparation.

Jim's was the only one of the NSTEP field-trial classes in which less than half the students intended to teach. He was aware of it and wondered: "Is this really the agenda that Black students would be concerned with. I just had the feeling that sex discrimination would not be as important as racial discrimination. But that did not come out in the discussion."

A student log did note that students felt the "costs of racial discrimination to be greater," but that caused little diminishment of NSTEP issues. One of the women students said, "I think it's very important. The sex of the child should not be a cause for labeling. Constraints should not be put on someone because they're girls or guys." A male said, "The woman always has been more responsible, but they don't get the credit for it."

Jim said, "It is interesting. A teacher could perhaps be conducting her class in such a way, going about it very professionally, and still make mistakes in terms of sex discrimination, and not be aware of it. Being very honest and sensitive in what she was doing and still end up discriminating. I think that's a plus for the materials. They point out what people have been doing for a long time without being aware of it."

In class Dr. Byrd spoke about research on stereotypes and the students discussed the Unit 3 situations and their own experiences. He said the students were inhibited at first by the presence of the evaluator, but later reacted in a typical fashion. "The Play" was discussed and generalizations drawn. The class opinion, almost unanimous, was that teachers do push math and science on boys and expect girls to excel in reading and writing. They agreed that teachers were not aware what they were doing, and that such discriminations should stop.

Commenting on the materials later a female student said, "When examples of real life situations are used they should tell the setting and the age of the children."

Dr. Byrd passed Unit 3 on to a colleague, Dr. Bell, who used it in her course. She and her students questioned the validity of the conclusions for minority populations, and recommended more ethnically differentiated studies.

Using Units 1 and 2

It was arranged that Charles Stanley, head of the Social Foundations Department at Florida A&M, would take charge of the instruction for the sex equity unit in Dr. Cooper's and Dr. Mercer's sections of the introductory course. In the former's section they had decided to use Linda Kerber's Woman's Place is in the Schools: The Impact of Women on American Education.

Dr. Stanley opened by telling the students the role Mary Bethune played in the history of a Black college well known to them. They showed strong interest. He talked of other accomplished Black women.

Then he got a discussion going by getting them personally involved. "How many of you intend to be principals?" No girls raised their hands. With a smile he said, "You mean I'm wasting my time?" He went on to discuss non-traditional roles for women and how traditional fields are given lower status when women are in them. The similarities of Black oppression and female oppression were brought out next. He discussed the opportunities for education and the education for certain low paying jobs, noting that Florida A&M was established for Blacks, with the curriculum showing its heritage. It began as a vocational school, was expanded only recently to meet HEW guidelines.

In Dr. Mercer's section, where the students had been assigned Rita Bornstein's Sexism in American Education, he started the discussion off by bringing out an article entitled "Girls Wrestling." He asked, "How would you boys feel about dating a girl on the wrestling team?" The boys rejected the idea. One said, "I don't feel it's a woman's sport." Expressing indignation a female loudly said, "What!" Another male said, "I think she'd have muscles and a figure that I'd not associate with." Many of the males had similar opinions. A number of females felt it would be good to wrestle. One spoke of its value as protection. Another said, "I think in America we should get away from girls being weaker." The discussion was heated and good humored. Some men seemed to change their minds, agreeing that wrestling alone shouldn't determine one's choice of date.

Other discussions centered around Bornstein's story of Emma, about what Twentieth Century women are doing, and whether or not Black women work only because they have to. Dr. Mercer wrote in his log: "The entire class felt that Black women have always worked. Twentieth Century Woman is only continuing something that Black women started years ago."

Not all students were convinced that sex equity was an important issue. One said: "70% of the class is for equity due to the fact that it's time for a change. The other 30% felt it should stay the same. They believed in idealism." Most felt the time spent on sex equity was well spent. One female said, "They all were very excited because it was new." Another: "I have learned a considerable amount from this material. Also it has helped me understand better the opposite sex. The information concerning Title IX was quite educational and informative. I think each student on all college campuses should be given a copy of this. It should be discussed in high schools as well as colleges."

ILLINOIS

Surrounded by glacier-flattened fields of black soil and green crops are the twin cities of Champaign and Urbana, neither much larger than the University of Illinois wedged between them. Many of the 35,000 students are temporarily dislocated from Chicago and its suburbs. Dutch Elm disease and anti-war protests have come and are long gone. The College of Education has its mind on educational policy research of some kind or other.

These are home towns and home bases for the field trial evaluators. For that reason and because over 40% of the field trial students were enrolled here, much more time was spent observing classes and interviewing students and instructors. Jo Friedman, graduate student in education, did much of that observation and co-authored the Illinois course descriptions.

Using Units 2 and 3

The History of Education class, taught by Paul Violis, a senior faculty member of national reputation, met twice a week for an hour lecture in a mid-sized modern auditorium, plus an hour a week in small groups. "The purpose of this course," Paul said, "is to develop a systematic analysis of education and schooling in America." Class enrollment neared 200. Each with a graduate teaching assistant in charge, the 19 small discussion groups were designed to give students the opportunity to clarify and discuss the lectures and reading assignments.

The NSTEP materials were assigned and discussed in these discussion groups. Information on the history of women in education was presented as part of the lecture format, but the NSTEP materials were not referred to directly. Some of the lecture corroborated information in the booklets. Most of the references in the lecture were references Paul said he used regularly. He addressed some issues in depth where Bornstein and Kerber did not. For example, several of his lectures showed the development of vocational education and the differential treatment that females and males received in the social, political and economic context.

Graduate teaching assistants distributed and used the NSTEP materials. At the beginning of the semester several expressed dissatisfaction with the Kerber material. One male: "It's a nice piece of sexism in its own right--and intellectually weak." Another: "It's the old-men-as-bastards stance. It also doesn't include economic, political, or theoretical considerations." But a female saw the material as "a good supplementary piece of work," similar to other articles distributed to their students.

The manner of presentation of the issues varied from discussion group to discussion group. Although the materials arrived late, most groups still devoted two discussion periods to them. One assistant introduced an article of her own on feminism, saying that students should be presented with a broader view of feminism than Kerber had. Two assistants structured their work to encourage students to think about the history of women and sex discrimination in political, social and economic frames. Each appeared to try to direct students toward considering the macro-organizational problems involved in eliminating sex discrimination, relating many to perceptions of the family unit.

Both Bornstein and Kerber were assigned but far more attention went to Kerber, especially in the sections with male assistants. Two presented the Kerber material these ways: "Read it if you can by next week. If not, I'll understand. There are a number of problems with it. Read it thinking about the purpose and assumptions. Tim Reagan (a Violis protege) wrote a critique and has blistering things to say about it. It's not just a piece of American history. There's a lot wrong with it." And: "You had a little test. You'll read these things and

then there'll be another test. We'll see how your ideas about sexism in education have changed... OK, let's get on to more important things. Whoa! ... different things."

Other assistants used Tim Reagan's critique with their sections, but Tim himself did not. He said, "I had intended to use it my classes..., but after the first discussion, I realized where they were coming from. It struck me as being far more important to simply get them to believe Kerber's thesis, which I do accept, and not give them additional evidence to attack the thesis."

In another section the discussion went something like this: Instructor: "Does it (the Kerber piece) analyze, as we did in 201, in terms of ideology--political and economic--and western migration?" Female: "They weren't pointed out but underneath they were there." The instructor suggested that perhaps it did not fit their course because it treated history as the story of great people, in this case, great women. Female: "We know men's role. Women's role is not (told) in histories. Why does Violis talk about important men? He kind of plays down women." Instructor: "Do you find the information in here (Kerber) important?" Female: "It fills in the facts." Instructor: "Was it an analysis?"

And so on for a few minutes, then: Another female: "The speaker made a real good point. Planters had a dominant role. Education was suffocated. I feel men had that role. They didn't think women should be educated." Another: "Men were villains all the way through." Another: "I didn't get the feeling they were." Another: "You know how Violis takes the men's role and just kinda throws in women's role. I feel that's the way this is. She (Kerber) talks about women and throws in men."

At the end of the semester the same general feelings about the Kerber booklet persisted. By and large, teaching assistants supported future inclusion of materials on sex equity and women in the history of education. It was felt that "consciousness" was low, that students needed information and opportunities to discuss these ideas. In one section each student was asked to recall an incident of sexism in their lives. One student could recall many. A majority could not recall one single incident. And, in another section, class participation was low at the beginning. A student said, "Maybe people are not informed enough. No one proposed ideas. No one offered an opinion. A majority were busy taking notes."

Bornstein got less attention in at least one female assistant's section and two male assistants' sections. A student said, "We went over the Kerber article in class but didn't have time for the Bornstein. ... The goal of Bornstein was to try to correct most of the problems there are today. Instead of saying, 'This is the way things are,' Bornstein's article is directed to what should be done. It was easy to read and I liked the style."

A woman assistant said: "The Kerber article was more of an article than an overall approach. I think Bornstein was good. I might have wanted to use it first if I had read through it. I argue with myself because sometimes it is better to give people the examples and then pull theory out of that. There was talk among assistants about the lack of theoretical development of the Kerber article. I don't think it had to have theory but that a theoretical article could have been incorporated into the discussion. All in all, I found Kerber a pretty good narrative. I will continue to use Bornstein and Kerber because I do feel that the role of women in education is slighted."

A female student said, "Bornstein...was the best. It was well organized and it had a touch of the humanistic approach, with enough statistics to make it believable." And another: "I thought Bornstein was good. That quiz in there, the whole thing about Title IX. We had a whole discussion about that in my section one day. I thought the Kerber article in the beginning was really in

depth and detailed--about the first two thirds. Then it didn't go into as much detail, especially when they talked about Black education." A male said of Bornstein: "I thought the Title IX information was helpful. They explained more than just the sports aspects of it. Self quizzes were helpful and give you a chance to examine your own thinking.... I have held some biased opinions and it stimulated me to...."

Discussions themselves varied greatly of course from section to section. These topics were overheard by observers: Differences between masculinity and femininity, sex role stereotypes, the role of the teacher in promoting equity, women in sports, needed structural changes in society. Few issues were pursued in depth. Tradition and religion were often recognized. Many students expressed internally-inconsistent views. Sharing experiences and doubts consumed much of the time.

Paul Violis felt that, as written, the materials stressed female equity, though traditional roles cause problems for both males and females. Reminded of reservations he had expressed in Washington, Paul said he had sent a list of suggestions for revision to Linda Kerber. As to his own teaching of sex equity he said, "In the historical section I talk about the differences in educational opportunity for males and females. I talk about the ways in which women and men are viewed...and try to show the consequences of those views in terms of both educational opportunities and larger life opportunities. We do that from the early colonial period to the present. Later when talking about a 'differentiated' curriculum we use the example of different views of men and women." He said these NSTEP materials reinforced much of what they had been doing in the past.

Paul went on, "I think I'd recommend the materials. It depends on the kind of class. They don't lend themselves to use in my class because of the way that class is structured, but I can see a class structured so that a unit on sex equity would fit in. I don't think that's the most efficient and appropriate way to teach that material however."

"Students had some awareness coming into the class, but the way we dealt with the issues heightened awareness and made the issues more clear. I hope they have a little more understanding."

Using Unit 3

Cordiality is not what greeted Lu Ann Smith when she faced the first of seventeen sections to present the issues of how teachers are involved in sex equity. She didn't have the materials students were to study. It seemed like more was being added to the course. And perhaps she was bringing the strife of contention over ERA in Illinois into their classroom.

Several of the students were outspokenly antagonistic. One young man said, "There has to be a reason for men and women to fit into roles. Might be a natural law--it would be the same if we started all over again." When Lu Ann said that research showed whatever tasks were assigned to women became low status tasks, one man said, "I don't agree with a lot of this." With what in particular? "Nothing specific, just the whole general thing." Students of both sexes intimated "Sex role stereotyping would always be present--it was useless to talk about it."

Lu Ann was there instead of the regular instructor that sixth week of classes because the Department of Educational Psychology had arranged for her, an advanced doctoral student, to give the 3 sex equity presentations.

The NSTEP materials (Gall and Gall: Boys and Girls in School: A Psychological Perspective) arrived in time to be read by that first section prior to their third class meeting. The next Friday a different tone predominated. The students seriously discussed biological differences, brain lateralization, and socialization of boys and girls. A male student who had protested earlier said, "After reading that section on exceptional learners, I felt like a real dummy." The exchange was lively and continued after the bell. Several sought out Lu Ann to talk further.

Probably for mixed reasons, the change was not as dramatic in the other sections. (She ultimately worked with only 12 sections, because of scheduling conflicts and because one instructor opposed the use of the NSTEP materials. Later some students indicated that Lu Ann seemed a reluctant presenter of the issues. Recognizing her own feelings, she may have been overly constrained, anxious to hear students out, respect their feelings. She was looking for answers too, saying:

> I am learning a lot from these students. They are not as alarmed, not as fearful of sex equity as earlier groups have been. They're not the ones "against." They're not the "anti" forces. So maybe I approached them too cautiously.

Some of her students objected to the sense of urgency of the NSTEP materials, saying that they thought society was responding to problems once unrecognized. Lu Ann disagreed, but did see room for improvement in the materials. She found them overly "redundant." She suggested that more about Carol Dwek's research on attribution theory and mathematics be included, also some of Bruce Hare's research on black and white achievement, and more about the work of Sheila Tobias. She felt the brain lateralization ideas should be developed further or left out. She also thought it might be better to switch the presentation of reading and math so that the problems of boys came first. She found the male students less defensive when they found the issue was "sex equity" rather than "women's rights."

Lu Ann's students were enrolled in one of two Ed Psy courses for teacher training, one more for elementary education, the other more for secondary. She thought the Gall and Gall writing more appropriate for the elementary education students. At least she found those students more genuinely interested.

In the first weeks Lu Ann directed student attention more directly to the NSTEP materials. Partly because she became bored with the repetition (facing 12 sections) she started involving students in an exercise. A student described it:

"Lu Ann asked us to prepare a press release on the hiring of a new district superintendent. After each of us filled it in, we gathered to discuss it. Students given information that the person's first name was D.A. did not presume that it was a woman. They pictured the superintendent as white, male, in the 40's, of medium build, tall, lean, grey, etc.

"Two students had been told D.A. stood for Dorothy A. The female of these two described her as grey haired, in the 40's, with a wise and honest facial expression. The male described her as a 'Jane Byrne type'--capable, with no sense of humor, not very tolerant, a woman trying to be like a man. Those who thought it was a woman assigned her a lower salary.

Lu Ann thought that the NSTEP materials should be incorporated into the course by instructors rather than be used as a separate unit. She said she would not teach a unit to 12 sections again. It might have been better had the students expected the unit to weigh as much in the final grade as other topics.

The class discussions appeared to be more intellectual and informative when the students discussed such NSTEP topics as differential achievement of boys and girls than when exercises were used to stimulate discussion. The discussions frequently were dominated by personal feelings. It was difficult for the instructor to get to the issues of teaching children in classrooms. Exercises such as "The Superintendent" (above) helped sensitize students to stereotypes but did not facilitate discussion of teacher responsibilities with children.

One could not observe these small group activities without concluding that the problems are complex, the value commitments of students (as of others) run deep, that support for educational practices to counter the inequities in opportunity comes from very few corners of our society, and that three hours or less of attention in an education class is not likely to have a lasting impact on many students. Still one young man said he decided not to skip class to leave early for Thanksgiving vacation so that he could participate in the discussion.

Using Units 4 and 5

Two sections of a "reading methods" course met once a week for a one hour discussion led by graduate student Karen Margolis. They also met for an hour lecture once a week by a senior professor. The NSTEP materials (units 4 and 5) were assigned as supplementary reading for discussion periods in two successive weeks. The students were asked (1) to write a critique of the materials, (2) to complete a project having to do with sex equity, (3) to evaluate one TV program for instances of sexism or unconventional non-sexism and (4) to read a short story entitled "Story" by Shirley Moreno from the October '72 issue of Women's Liberation Review.

The NSTEP materials had not arrived by the first session scheduled for sex equity. Karen talked about reviewing the TV program. In her log she wrote:

> I think this will be a good way to ease into the NSTEP materials, discussing how the views kids come to the classroom with are influenced by the TV they watch, and discussing what sex roles seem to be promoted by a lot of the TV available to kids.

Her assignment had an intentionally vague second part: Choose a project which allows you to explore more closely a particular area in feminist issues, concluding with its relevance (or if you determine so, its irrelevance) to educational issues. Karen met with each of her 39 students to discuss what they planned to do.

Some students used Observation Checklist #4 (S&S p. 58) as their project. Karen asked them in class about the inclusiveness of the categories. Some students remarked that the margin terms were indefinite, that time might better be spent describing teacher and pupil behavior. The discussion shifted to observation during "Junior Practice." It was a lively discussion, with many questions of observation methodology.

Other student projects including reading and reviewing books such as And Jill Came Tumbling After: Sexism in American Education; Cooperation Between the Sexes and The Feminine Mystique. One student developed non-sexist learning materials on occupations using the book, Fire Girl. Another prepared a unit on women scientists for fourth graders. Other exemplary projects included research activities on classroom interaction patterns, observations of sexism in physical education, and examining math textbooks for sex role stereotyping.

The story by Moreno caricatures a mother's sacrifice for her family, ending with the mother serving her own heart: "She served the heart. They ate it. She died that afternoon, after washing up, so they had to have a cold tea." In class Karen asked if the story could be used in reading class to teach comprehension skills. According to Karen's account, the students said that the story was too gross, too biased--then some suggested the story be used but with another extreme example from another point of view.

In one discussion, both instructor and students thought Beyond the Dick and Jane Syndrome's attention to bias in language usage became "picky, superficial." A student said, "I don't think they mean man as men but men as people." Another, "I hate these awkward words like salesperson." Another, "Mankind is very basic." And Karen said, "Using non-sexist words is a band-aid approach publishers use." Some students presented the view that the language accurately

expressed the situation (male dominance) and wondered if it should be changed. The discussion again was lively. Karen had to cut it off to bring up a consideration of reading comprehension. (In her log Karen wrote: "I found myself fighting the urge to give my opinions.")

Some students said they were insulted by Unit 4 because it tended to blame the teachers for all the problem. (Karen felt relieved to get to Unit 5 where "the tone was better.") Another said, "I found the case studies absolutely ridiculous. I could not believe that teachers are that obvious and unthinking in their comments to students. I have never observed teachers acting this way." And adding, "I don't know if I liked all that fill-in-the-blanks. Maybe they wanted our reactions but I felt like they just had us do (their) work. I'd rather read more. I could apply what I learned myself." And ending, "What I liked was when you had to pick out which form of sexism was in the example. It got me a lot more involved."

One student, reading (p. 8) that a woman with a college degree earns less than a high school drop-out, said, "Doing what?" Another said, "The Assessment of Sex Equity in Teacher Interactions was the most beneficial to me. I could see testing myself as to the way I treat my students." Another: "This Unit makes it seem much more easy to eliminate sex bias than it really is. Many of the costs this article cites seem too far removed from the classroom to put the blame there. Society is a great reinforcer." And another: "I liked the point brought out in the Unit about how children's achievement changes to fulfill teacher expectations. Very frightening to think of having that power." And still another: "Unit 4 was in my opinion exaggerated. It might have been relevant some years ago but it is not completely true today. Unit 5 was more relevant to today's classroom."

Students here generally were reluctant to accept the idea of studying nonsexist teacher education materials. A student said, "At first many people resented the idea but later found it interesting and thought-provoking. The only problem we may have had was that there was only one boy in the class, and he usually had some insight. Perhaps a mixed class might have had more-varied opinions."

The materials appeared to influence the thinking of many of Karen's students. But many students had second thoughts about the NSTEP project when they faced the final examination, a departmental examination without sex equity questions. The course evaluations indicated many felt "gypped" out of learning more about reading skills because of the attention to sex equity.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

John F. Kennedy once characterized it as a town of northern hospitality and southern efficiency--Washington, D.C. Located in one of the city's most beautiful residential areas, the American University is only minutes from downtown Washington, yet seemingly far removed from the object of Kennedy's acerbic wit. Fine old trees and open spaces dot the campus, lending a suburban air amidst the hustle and bustle of the seat of power. A new, modern-design library restates the University's commitment to quality education. The School of Education where NSTEP makes it home is one of the buildings outlining the campus quadrangle. (These American University observations were prepared by Tom Hicks, NSTEP Coordinator.)

Teaching Unit 1, with some attention to Unit 2

Martha Umstott usually includes a sexism-in-education component in her Foundations of Education course anyway, but Bornstein's Sexism in American Education provided her with additional, complementary materials. The Foundations class at American centers mainly on contemporary issues in education, with slight attention given to historical aspects--so Martha used Linda Kerber's The Impact of Women on American Education as supplementary reading materials for her students.

Martha lectured on the impact of sex bias in education and led discussion on attitudes toward sex-roles of males & females, sex-role stereotyping and sex-role expectations. With a class of 15 female and 5 male students the discussion was at first dominated by the female students. The females made lengthy observations and affirmed the examples of inequity in the Bornstein module. As the discussion continued, however, the males in the class became more actively involved, voicing a commitment to issues related to sex equity. As one student declared, "Everybody was more into it (sex equity) after we read the materials."

One male student observed that most textbooks he had encountered reinforce sex stereotypes. He cited a teacher education text that he was using in another class which constantly referred to teachers as "she" and administrators as "he." A female student picked up on the observation and went on to comment that in some instances texts which try to include a balanced picture of sex-role perceptions tend to over-compensate for former omission, creating an unrealistic portrait.

One issue which aroused great comment and controversy was a teacher's responsibility in shaping the sex-role behaviors of students, i.e., should a teacher go against patterns of behavior encouraged by parents. While the general reaction was that teachers should be careful not to assess parent-encouraged sex-role behavior judmentally, teachers should provide equal opportunity for children of both sexes in the classroom.

The majority of those in the class seemed commited to sex equity and to implementing sex-fair practices in their classrooms. It was hard to gauge the effect of the materials since the group appeared to be a very cosmopolitan group. They exhibited a familiarity with issues of sex equity and sex bias, so most points made in the module did not seem foreign to the majority of the group.

There was some objection to the "soap opera" tone of the stories of Emma and Joe in Sexism in Education. One student commented that "It was just too much!" However, one student observed,"The history (of sex bias) had the greatest impact on me. My mother is a teacher and so was her mother, so I had heard about some of the inequities that existed in the past, but the material presented in the module (Kerber's) really hit hard...it's ridiculous, the things that went on."

Using Unit 3

A mysterious silence pervaded Franz Huber's Psychology of Education class the day he introduced the NSTEP module (Gall & Gall: Boys and Girls in School: A Psychological Perspective) for discussion. This puzzled Franz, who said the group was usually very talkative. It was, however, close to the end of the semester and topics in addition to sexism had yet to be covered.

Franz provided students with a handout on "Actual, Mythical, and Equivocal Sex Differences," but it was strictly Franz's questioning that evoked responses from students. The 23 students in the class (5 males, 18 females) offered most of their comments in response to direct, pointed questions on sex bias in education and society; the role of teachers and parents in either promoting or retarding sex equity; the responsibility of publishers and authors. But the one issue which prompted the greatest controversy was sex bias in religion.

A male and a female student drew their stands on the question and provided the most lively interchange of the period. The female student insisted that teachers should be very careful in tampering with religious beliefs. The male student pointed out that some churches were very sexist and organized religion should stay out of politics. The female student responded that in relation to education, sexism, and relgion, a teacher has no right to deal with the religious beliefs of children; thus when sex equity and religious beliefs come into conflict, the teacher must back off, assigning resolution of it to parents.

Other students, in response to questions posed by Franz, observed the overshadowing role of parents in establishing sex appropriate patterns for their children. A female student noted, "A teachers's role is limited in promoting sex equity because the past experiences of parents--their own sex role expectations--play into the behavior they expect from their kids." And it may not be parents alone, as another female student added. While in the field, the student observed a teacher who expressed concern over sexism in education and then went on to display sexist patterns and behaviors. The student concluded that teachers also tend to repeat old, sexist patterns even though they may be aware of the problem.

Some students were more talkative and ready to share their opinions when interviewed outside the classroom. One major concern voiced by a female student was the applicability of the materials. "I was at a loss to determine what to do. I would have liked more approaches in addition to the research--some applications are missing." The student did go on to add that, "It was great to have some of my common knowledge (on sexism) validated by statistics."

Another student insisted that "people other than just those who are going to be teachers should be exposed to this material." Sociology was mentioned as one likely subject area for inclusion of the material.

Franz commented on some of the students' reactions, "These same students previously read and discussed two other non-sexist modules (NSTEP) in the Foundations of Education class. Some students indicated to me they had had it with the topic."

Using Units 4 and 5

The students in Donni Hassler's Social Studies and Language Arts Methods class spend the greater part of the semester in the field. Donni was uncertain if the NSTEP materials would be ready in time for her to use them. The materials were ready the day the students were to go to the field. She introduced the Gollnick et al. module, Beyond the Dick and Jane Syndrome, and the Sadker and Sadker module, Between Teacher and Student. Donni assigned the observation chart in the latter module as part of the students' field responsibility.

When the students returned--8 weeks later--they met again to discuss the NSTEP materials. Donni had prepared a variety of activities for that class meeting, including a slide presentation, a record, and other materials aimed at stimulating discussion on sexism. The students had been asked to complete the case studies in the Gollnick module (p 23-27) in preparation for discussion.

The class discussion focused on sex-role stereotyping, sex-role expectations, classroom materials and sex bias in materials. Of the 14 students in the class (2 males, 12 females) the females participated more frequently. The males tended to be reticient to contribute, and at times acted negatively to the materials and the topic. One of the male students, reacting to the Gollnick case study exercise, thought the situations were tricky, eliciting responses that required reading between the lines: "You can twist anything around to find sex bias."

The discussion was at times lively, ranging from the special problems of "tomboys" to the changes segments of society are making to eliminate the distinction between male and female roles. Few of the comments were directed at the issues specifically raised by the modules. Some students did observe that teachers should be fair. One student commented that "boys don't have the patience or interest in delicate things that girls have, (so girls and boys might be assigned different toys or assignments." This drew hearty boos.

Most of the reactions from students seemed to come from a gut level. There was some degree of equating sex equity to the women's liberation movement. One student felt the best way to treat the issue of sex equity was not to make it an issue: "I don't see that much of a problem with this issue anyway."

Some of the students seemed to take non-sexist teaching suggestions presented in the modules as prescriptions, and reacted strongly against them. On the other hand, one student commented, "I'm already so overburdened in preparing for the subject-matter apsect of this Methods course that adding the additional burden of studying sex equity was too much." Donni felt that the students were anxious to perform well in Methods. Additional material may have been a burden.

Donni later decided that the students had not read the assigned NSTEP materials, that the class had considered the sex equity modules separate and distinct from the Methods content. As a result, she tried out the materials again the following semester in a different way with a new group of students. This time she assigned them as required reading and included items from the modules on the final exam. She spent only part of one period going over the materials. From pretest and post-test attitude survey it appeared that this group was more disposed to sex equity issues than the first group. Donni felt that incorporating the NSTEP materials into the requirements of the course--rather than presenting them as ancillary materials--made the students more disposed to view sex equity as an integral part of teacher training.

Attitudes of Students

This section is a record of the attitudes of the College of Education students toward sex equity as obtained during the field trial.

The evaluation specialists constructed pretest and posttest attitude scales to obtain a portion of their observations of the workings and success of the field trial instruction. (Copies of these two scales follow.) Each was to be administered by the participating instructor--the pretest prior to introducing the topic formally and the posttest perhaps a couple of weeks after principal attention to sex equity had ended. It was suggested that ten minutes was ample for the students to respond.

The items were intended to reveal the importance of sex equity issues in the minds of the students, the perceptions they had of their own knowledge of teacher roles in exacerbating and relieving the problems, and their feelings about particular manifestations of differential treatment of boys and girls.

A few students at several universities were taught sex equity lessons in more than one NSTEP course. Repeated response sheets were not removed from the count. Students omitting particular information were not included in percentages.

The table next to follow indicates the nature of the student group and the pages thereafter indicate the findings from the scales. The results from Northern Colorado and one class at Miami were not received in time to be included in this report.

A Questionnaire for Professional Education Students

Ψ 1.2

College or University_____ Student Name_____

Instructor_____ Student: Sex_____ Age_____

Date_____ Do you intend to become a teacher?_____

In what size community did you spend most of your childhood?
___urban ___suburban ___small city ___town/rural

What subject matters and level would you prefer to teach?
___elementary ___math ___English ___science ___music
___jr high ___soc studies ___phys ed/coaching ___art
___high school ___vocational ___special education
___other ___other:_____

How would you describe your own political outlook?
___on the liberal side ___on the conservative side ___neutral

These questions are being asked as part of a research project on teacher training. The responses are not intended for evaluation of individual students in any way, but only to find out the collective perceptions and opinions of contemporary students. More about the study can be obtained from David and Myra Sadker, College of Education, American University, Washington D.C. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and any offensive or irrelevant questions need not be answered. It is hoped that each student will accept this questionnaire as part of a legitimate research effort and answer each question.

We welcome notes in margins or on the back. Thanks.

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

Some school tax money is used for athletics. Do you object to spending more for boys' than girls' athletic programs? ___Yes ___No

Do you feel that girls have to overcome more social pressure than boys to enroll in advanced science and math courses? ___Yes ___No

How much do you feel you know about each of these:	Quite a bit	A little	Nothing
Teacher unions	___	___	___
Student motivations	___	___	___
Sex role stereotyping	___	___	___
Youth unemployment	___	___	___

During the 1960s attempts were made to use the educational system to bring about social change. How do you feel about improving our society by teaching social values?

___Schools should lead the way to restore the traditional values in our society.
___Schools should lead the way toward correcting the inequities in our society.
___Schools should teach about values, but should not pressure toward any one value commitment.
___Other:

There are claims that young women do not become doctors and engineers as much as young men do, and that young men do not have equal opportunity to become nurses and secretaries. How do you feel about that?

___It is untrue. They have equal opportunities.
___There are good reasons why most doctors and engineers should be men, and nurses and secretaries should be women.
___The opportunities are not equal, but it is not proper for teachers to try to change such things.
___The opportunities are not equal and teachers should help youngsters consider nontraditional career options.

Is this part of "the problem?" Teachers give girls encouragement to be gentle and caring more than boys--and they tolerate assertiveness in boys much more than in girls.

___No, it's not part of any important problem I know of.
___Yes, it's part of it. ___I don't know.

A Questionnaire for Professional Education Students

Ψ 2.0

College or University_____ Student Name_____

Instructor_____ Date_____

These are additional questions for the research project on teacher training being run by David and Myra Sadker, Education, American University, Washington D.C. Participation is entirely voluntary and any offensive or irrelevant questions need not be answered.

During the term your class studied some problems of sex equity in our society and possible steps teachers might take to analyze and diminish those problems. How do you feel about the main ideas and the materials used? (Check as many blanks as you wish to.) Thanks.

As a result of your readings and discussions, do you feel you have a better understanding of teacher influences on sex stereotyping?
___Yes ___No

Should "sex equity" be taught in this course again? ___Yes ___No

I think the sex equity ideas presented were:
___important ___too abstract ___out-of-date ___clear
___unimportant ___too simplistic ___timely ___confusing

I think the reading materials assigned were:
___poorly written ___not relevant ___too brief ___excellent
___well written ___relevant ___too long ___terrible

During the sex equity lessons did you experience a moment of special insight or see something in a new light, something to be remembered probably for a long time? ___Yes ___No (If yes and you care to, please describe it briefly on the back.)

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

Some school tax money is used for athletics. Do you object to spending more for boys' than girls' athletic programs? ___Yes ___No

Do you feel that girls have to overcome more social pressure than boys to enroll in advanced science and math courses? ___Yes ___No

How much do you feel you know about each of these:	Quite a bit	A little	Nothing
Teacher unions	___	___	___
Student motivations	___	___	___
Sex role stereotyping	___	___	___
Youth unemployment	___	___	___

There are claims that young women do not become doctors and engineers as much as young men do, and that young men do not have equal opportunity to become nurses and secretaries. How do you feel about that?
___It is untrue. They have equal opportunities.
___There are good reasons why most doctors and engineers should be men, and nurses and secretaries should be women.
___The opportunities are not equal, but it is not proper for teachers to try to change such things.
___The opportunities are not equal and teachers should help youngsters consider nontraditional career options.

During the 1960s attempts were made to use the educational system to bring about social change. How do you feel about improving our society by teaching social values?
___Schools should lead the way to restore the traditional values in our society.
___Schools should lead the way toward correcting the inequities in our society.
___Schools should teach about values, but should not pressure toward any one value commitment.
___Other:

Is this part of "the problem?" Teachers give girls encouragement to be gentle and caring more than boys--and they tolerate assertiveness in boys much more than in girls.
___No, it's not part of any important problem I know of.
___Yes, it's part of it. ___I don't know.

THE STUDENTS RESPONDING TO THE NSTEP FIELD TRIAL ATTITUDE SCALES

In the course:	at:	taught by:	Pretest Students: Pre-test N	Sex: F	Sex: M	Mdn Age	Level of prep: El	Level of prep: Jr	Level of prep: Hi	Level of prep: Othr	Intdg to tch	Post-test N	Prs
EdFdn	AmerU	Umstott	23	17	5	20	56%	13%	31%	0	78%	21	19
EdPsy	AmerU	Huber	27	21	6	20	71%	0	29%	0	78%	17	16
TchMth	AmerU	Hassler	14	14	0	21	100%	0	0	0	79%	13	12
TchMth	AmerU	Hassler	(16)	(13)	(3)	(20)	(92%)	(0)	(0)	(8%)	(88%)	(16)	(14)
ChDev	BnkSt	Cole	(17)	(16)	(1)	(29)	(88%)	(12%)	(0)	(0)	(94%)	(13)	(7)
Curric	BnkSt	Cuffaro	26	23	3	26	90%	0	0	10%	96%	21	21
TchMth	BnkSt	Takanishi	20	17	2	30	89%	0	0	11%	100%	13	13
EdFdn	FlaAM	Cooper	19	12	7	21	27%	13%	53%	7%	72%	17	13
EdFdn	FlaAM	Mercer	25	16	9	21	33%	10%	52%	5%	68%	25	24
EdPsy	FlaAM	Byrd	15	10	5	21	55%	9%	27%	9%	40%	10	10
TchMth	FlaAM	Ellis	21	18	3	21	57%	10%	24%	10%	90%	21	20
ChLit	FlaAM	Ellis	18	15	3	21	76%	0	18%	6%	83%	19	16
EdFdn	Houst	Liberman	19	15	4	22	47%	11%	37%	5%	89%	14	14
IntEd	Houst	Newlin	32	29	3	24	91%	6%	3%	3%	100%	29	29
TchMth	Houst	Newman	31	26	4	24	85%	15%	0	0	94%	27	26
EdHist	Illin	Violis	174	131	41	20	41%	13%	41%	4%	86%	70	53
EdPsy	Illin	Smith	195	151	42	20	49%	9%	32%	10%	75%	178	151
RdMth	Illin	Margolis	37	36	1	21	89%	6%	3%	3%	89%	38	36
IntEd	Miami	Felz	32	26	6	19	48%	16%	32%	4%	63%	31	31
EdPsy	Miami	Peleg	8	5	3	35	43%	14%	14%	29%	88%	7	7
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	43	26	17	26	36%	17%	25%	22%	87%	29	26
SecEd	Oregon	Bullock	9	5	3	22	25%	38%	38%	0	100%	8	7
EdFdn	NColo	Jacobs	data not yet available										
EdPsy	NColo	Carter											
Curric	SFrSt	Bixler	78	66	12	24	85%	9%	1%	5%	96%	61	56
Curric	SFrSt	Seliers	29	26	3	22	85%	8%	4%	4%	93%	22	19
SecEd	SFrSt	Roberts	18	14	4	24	0	28%	72%	0	100%	17	17
EdFdn	WMich	Howard	18	17	1	21	89%	0	11%	0	100%	11	10
EdFdn	WMich	Hungerford	14	7	7	22	38%	15%	46%	0	100%	16	14
TchMth	WMich	Cain	17	16	1	22	75%	6%	0	19%	94%	16	15
Totals			962	762	193	22	58%	10%	25%	7%	81%	751	675

The tallies indicate that 962 took pretests, 751 took posttests. Reasons for poor posttest participation, especially in Violis' class, were not discovered. Many responses were anonymous. Only 675 pretest-posttest pairs were recognized.

Females outnumbered male students 4 to 1. Median age was 22. 58% were preparing to teach in elementary school, 25% secondary. 19% were not intending to teach.

Many of the student attitude data were studied with an eye to the NSTEP unit assigned their class. In most classes only one of the five available units was assigned. The units had been prepared for use more or less as follows:

Unit	Primarily for:	Authors	Title
1	Intro to Education; Social Fdns of Ed	Rita Bornstein	Sexism in American Education
2	History of Educatn	Linda K Kerber	Woman's Place is in the Schools: The Impact of Women on American Education
3	Ed Psychology; Child Study	Meredith D Gall Joyce P Gall	Boys and Girls in School: A Psychological Perspective
4	Teaching Methods	Myra Sadker David Sadker	Between Teacher and Student: Overcoming Sex Bias in the Classroom
5	Curriculum; Elementary Educ; Secondary Ed	Donna M Gollnick Myra Sadker David Sadker	Beyond the Dick and Jane Syndrome: Sex Bias in Instructional Materials

The data on whether or not the field trial students (at posttest time) favored the teaching of sex equity in future classes are presented next. To see if this response was related to particular NSTEP writings we broke the students into groups according to which (if any) NSTEP units they were assigned to read.

There were six sections in which the instructor did not make specific assignments of NSTEP writings. One at Illinois was dropped from the evaluation because the number of Illinois students already was disproportionately large. In two sections, Cole's and Hassler's autumn section, there was so little emphasis put on the NSTEP materials that their results were tallied but kept separate. In Hassler's winter section the students studied both Units 4 & 5. Felz made Units 1, 2 & 3 available to his Miami students. At Bank Street College, Takanishi provided her students with Unit 3 and Cuffaro provided her students with Unit 4.

Results from Lorton's section at Miami were misplaced. Posttest results from Jacobs and Carter at Northern Colorado were not available at the time this report was prepared. To maintain comparability the Colorado pretest results were not included. The third Colorado instructor, Lewis, dropped from the field trial. Moursand at Oregon participated in the teaching but did not administer the attitude scales.

Smith and Liberman, respectively, were brought in to educational psychology sections at Illinois and an educational foundations course at Houston exclusively to present the sex equity instruction.

I think the reading materials assigned were:

___poorly written ___well written ___not relevant ___relevant ___too brief ___too long ___excellent ___terrible

In the course:	at:	taught by:	N	poorly written	well written	not relevant	relevant	too brief	too long	excellent	terrible
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Howard	11	1	10	0	7	0	0	1	0
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Hungrfd	16	5	2	5	5	1	3	0	0
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Mercer	19	0	14	0	5	3	1	5	0
Entr Ed	Houstn	Newlin	29	1	12	1	13	1	7	6	1
Ed Fdns	N Colo	Jacobs									
Unit 1 Percentages of			75	9%	51%	8%	40%	7%	15%	16%	1%
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Cooper	17	0	12	1	6	0	1	2	0
Ed Hist	Oregon	Edson	29	17	7	8	5	9	2	3	7
Unit 2 Percentages of			46	37%	41%	20%	24%	20%	7%	11%	15%
Ed Fdns	Amer U	Umstott	21	4	7	0	11	0	7	2	0
Ed Hist	Illin	Violis	70	6	34	4	34	4	19	7	1
Units 1&2 Percentages of			91	11%	45%	4%	49%	4%	29%	10%	1%
Ed Fdns	Houstn	Libermn	14	1	6	2	6	0	2	2	1
Ch Stdy	Illin	Smith	85	6	47	3	47	2	15	4	0
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	93	7	39	6	62	4	12	7	2
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	17	1	7	0	7	1	7	2	0
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	7	0	6	0	6	1	1	1	0
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter									
Unit 3 Percentages of			216	7%	49%	5%	59%	4%	17%	7%	1%
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	10	0	5	0	5	0	1	3	0
Theory	Fla AM	Ellis	21	0	12	0	13	4	0	5	0
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	61	1	23	2	45	5	4	9	0
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	22	0	11	0	9	0	0	4	0
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	16	0	10	0	12	0	1	4	0
Unit 4 Percentages of			130	1%	47%	2%	65%	10%	5%	19%	0%
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	19	0	14	0	4	1	1	5	0
Unit 5 Percentages of			19	0%	74%	0%	21%	5%	5%	26%	0%
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	8	2	4	0	5	0	2	1	0
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	17	0	6	0	10	1	4	1	0
RdgMth	Illin	Margolis	38	8	12	0	28	0	1	2	0
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	13	0	7	0	12	1	4	1	0
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	27	3	10	1	14	3	2	2	0
Units 4&5 Precentages of			103	13%	38%	1%	57%	5%	13%	7%	0%
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	31	2	19	0	10	3	3	9	0
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	(16)	(0)	(5)	(1)	(7)	(0)	(3)	(1)	(0)
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	13	0	3	1	5	1	1	4	0
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	21	3	7	1	7	0	2	3	0
Ch Dev	BankSt	Cole	(13)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Others Percentages of			65	8%	45%	3%	34%	6%	9%	25%	0%
GRAND TOTALS			745	68	346	35	383	45	103	95	12
Percentages				9%	46%	5%	51%	6%	14%	13%	2%

In this item the students indicated opinions of quality of whatever teaching materials were assigned (not necessarily from NSTEP).

Half said they were well written and relevant. Less than 10% of them said the opposite. 13% of them went so far as to say the materials were excellent. Only 2% found them terrible. More saw them too long than too brief.

The only substantial criticism came from Edson's section. He had previously spoken of numerous shortcomings in Unit 2--but then so had Violis, whose students were supportive of Units 1 and 2.

STUDENT VIEWS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SEX EQUITY ISSUE

On the posttest several items were included to find out whether or not the students considered sex equity to be a matter of serious concern and whether or not teachers had a responsibility to relieve problems of that sort. The posttest instructions included these words:

> During the term your class studied some problems of sex equity in our society and possible steps teachers might take to analyze and diminish those problems. How do you feel about the main ideas and the materials used? (Check as many blanks as you wish to.) Thanks.

Note that respondents were not forced to choose a response. Omitting items was not discouraged. Even so, of course, a number of students found some of the items objectionable and made marginal notes to that effect.

751 students in 27 classes provided responses for our analysis. Their responses are tallied class by class on the following page, then summed according to the NSTEP materials assigned on the page following that.

Over 2/3 of the students volunteered the information that the "sex equity" ideas presented were "important." Only 3% said that they were "unimportant." A follow-up look was taken at the 21 students who rated the ideas unimportant. Ten were Illinois students; but that is only slightly more than the proportion of Illinois students in the total sample. Five were from Houston--the expected frequency from Houston would have been only two. (The frequencies are far too small to make much of, of course. Still, we kept speculating.) Eight of the 21 were male, the expected frequency there was only four. The age, childhood home, and teaching intentions of the 21 were not distincitive. Of the 21 five considered themselves more on the liberal side of the political spectrum, 8 more on the conservative side. There seemed to be more association of ratings of "unimportance" with "conservative" sections of the country and with sex than with the avowed political persuasion of the respondent.

Of the students who were assigned NSTEP materials on these 10 campuses 25% specifically indicated that the ideas were "timely." About 5% said they were "out-of-date." By this, at least a few meant that people once had been insensitive to the inequities but that it was no longer a problem.

One third of the students gave specific notice that the sex equity ideas were "clear." About 4% said they were"confusing."

I think the sex equity ideas presented were:
___important ___too abstract ___out-of-date ___clear
___unimportant ___too simplistic ___timely ___confusing

In the course:	at:	taught by:	students	"important"	"unimportant"	"too abstract"	"too simplistic"	"out-of-date"	"timely"	"clear"	"confusing"
Intr to Ed	Houst	Newlin	29	22	3	0	2	2	9	8	2
Intr to Ed	Miami	Felz	31	17	1	2	3	1	6	13	3
Ed Fdns	AmerU	Umstott	21	9	0	1	6	2	3	8	0
Ed Fdns	FlaAM	Cooper	17	9	0	1	1	3	2	5	1
Ed Fdns	FlaAM	Mercer	25	13	0	0	0	0	2	5	1
Ed Fdns	Houst	Libermn	14	10	2	0	0	0	4	5	1
Ed Fdns	WMich	Howard	11	9	0	0	0	0	3	4	1
Ed Fdns	WMich	Hungrfd	16	4	1	0	6	6	1	3	1
Ed Fdns	NColo	Jacobs									
Hist of Ed	Illin	Violis	70	51	2	1	5	4	23	27	2
Hist of Ed	Oregn	Edson	29	12	2	1	13	3	4	5	7
Ed Psych	AmerU	Huber	17	7	0	0	6	1	2	7	2
Ed Psych	FlaAM	Byrd	10	6	0	0	0	1	1	4	0
Ed Psy (el)	Illin	Smith	85	58	4	5	13	8	17	22	3
Ed Psy (se)	Illin	Smith	93	67	3	1	16	2	31	34	5
Ed Psych	Miami	Peleg	7	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	0
Ed Psych	NColo	Carter									
Ch Dev*	Bk St	Cole	(13)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Ed Psych	Oregn	Maursnd									
Sec Ed	Oregn	Bullock	8	8	0	1	1	0	5	3	0
Sec Ed	SF St	Roberts	17	14	0	1	2	0	5	4	2
Ch Lit	FlaAM	Ellis	19	14	0	0	0	3	4	6	0
Curric	Bk St	Cuffaro	21	14	0	1	1	0	7	9	0
Curric	SF St	Bixler	61	46	0	3	9	3	14	20	1
Curric	SF St	Sellers	22	19	0	0	2	0	9	7	0
Curric	Miami	Lorton									
Rdg Mth	Illin	Mrgolis	38	27	1	3	7	3	7	14	0
Thy Prac	FlaAM	Ellis	21	17	0	1	1	1	4	4	0
Tch Meth	Bk St	Tkanshi	13	6	1	2	0	0	5	2	0
Tch Meth	Houst	Newman	27	19	0	1	3	0	8	11	0
Tch Meth	WMich	Cain	16	14	1	0	0	0	4	7	0
Tch Meth	AmerU	Hassler	13	9	0	0	5	0	7	9	1
Tch Meth*	AmerU	Hassler	(16)	(12)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(11)	(7)	(0)
	TOTALS		751	507	21	25	97	43	191	249	30
				68%	3%	3%	13%	6%	25%	33%	4%

*Students in these classes not assigned NSTEP materials

Should "sex equity" be taught in this course again? ___Yes ___No

In the course:	at:	taught by:	Number of Students Responding: Yes	No	Omit	Total
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Howard	8	3	0	11
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Hungrfd	7	3	6	16
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Mercer	17	1	7	25
Entr Ed	Houstn	Newlin	20	3	6	29
Ed Fdns	N Colo	Jacobs				
UNIT 1 TOTAL			52	10	19	81
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Cooper	13	3	1	17
Ed Hist	Oregon	Edson	16	5	8	29
UNIT 2 TOTAL			29	8	9	46
Ed Fdns	Amer U	Umstott	17	3	1	21
Ed Hist	Illin	Violis	50	1	19	70
UNITS 1 & 2 TOTAL			67	4	20	91
Ed Fdns	Houstn	Libermn	7	3	4	14
Ch Srdy	Illin	Smith	67	10	8	85
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	78	6	9	93
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	12	1	4	17
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	7	0	0	7
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter				
UNIT 3 TOTAL			171	20	25	216
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	10	0	0	10
Theory	Fla AM	Ellis	16	3	2	21
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	45	3	13	61
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	21	0	1	22
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	12	1	3	16
UNIT 4 TOTAL			104	7	19	130
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	14	2	3	19
UNIT 5 TOTAL			14	2	3	19
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	8	0	0	8
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	14	2	1	17
RdgMth	Illin	Margolis	24	7	7	38
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	9	3	1	13
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	21	2	4	27
UNITS 4 & 5 TOTAL			76	14	13	103
Int Ed	Miami	Felz	26	2	3	31
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	13	0	3	16
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	9	0	4	13
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	14	0	7	21
Ch Dev	BankSt	Cole	1	2	10	13
NO-UNITS-ASSIGNED TOTAL			63	4	27	94
GRAND TOTAL			576	69	135	780

The conclusion is clear. By a great majority (74%) the students of this field trial supported continued teaching of sex equity issues in the course they were taking.

Student opposition to such teaching ranged from a low of 4% in the classes assigned Units 1 & 2 to a high of 17% in classes assigned Unit 2 alone.

As might be expected, in the five classes where NSTEP materials were merely made available only a few (4%) students opposed the continued teaching of the sex equity topic.

The following 10 pages all pertain to a single attitude-scale item. This item was devised to compare the importance of the concept of "equal opportunity for men and women" against other contemporary social issues.

The NSTEP attitude scale item was: ✓ Pretest

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

The responses to the line TEENAGE DRINKING AND DRUGS were as follows:

in the course:	at:	taught by:	(100) Very imp.	(50) Some imp.	Not imp.	No opnn	Omit	Total	Median
Ed Fdn	Amer U	Umstott	17	6	0	0	)	23	91
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	21	6	0	0	0	27	93
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	12	2	0	0	0	14	96
TchMth*	Amer U	Hassler	(16)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(16)	(100)
Ch Dev*	BankSt	Cole	(12)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(17)	(90)
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	19	7	0	0	0	26	91
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	16	3	0	0	1	20	95
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Cooper	15	3	1	0	0	19	93
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Mercer	20	5	0	0	0	25	94
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	9	6	0	0	0	15	83
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	18	0	0	0	0	18	100
ThryPr	Fla AM	Ellis	19	2	0	0	0	21	97
Ed Fdn	Houstn	Librmn	16	3	0	0	0	19	95
IntrEd	Houstn	Newlin	32	0	0	0	0	32	100
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	27	4	0	0	0	31	96
EdHist	Illin	Violis	134	37	2	1	0	174	93
ChStdy	Illin	Smith	74	15	1	2	1	93	95
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	72	29	1	0	0	102	90
RdgMth	Illin	Mrgolis	29	8	0	0	0	37	93
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	27	5	0	0	0	32	95
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	7	1	0	0	0	8	96
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	25	16	0	2	0	43	84
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	7	2	0	0	0	9	93
Ed Fdn	N Colo	Jacobs							
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter							
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	56	22	0	0	0	78	90
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	23	6	0	0	0	29	93
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	18	0	0	0	0	18	100
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Howard	15	2	0	0	1	18	97
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Hungrfd	12	2	0	0	0	14	96
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	12	5	0	0	0	17	90
		TOTAL	752	197	5	5	3	962	93

*NSTEP materials not assigned

The NSTEP attitude scale item was: ✓ Posttest

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

The responses to the line TEENAGE DRINKING AND DRUGS were as follows:

in the course:	at:	taught by:	(100) Very imp.	(50) Some imp.	Not imp.	No opnn	Omit	Total	Median
Ed Fdn	Amer U	Umstott	16	5	0	0	0	21	92
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	13	4	0	0	0	17	92
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	12	1	0	0	0	13	98
TchMth*	Amer U	Hassler	(15)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(16)	(98)
Ch Dev*	BankSt	Cole	(9)	(4)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(13)	(89)
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	15	6	0	0	0	21	92
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	10	1	1	0	1	13	95
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Cooper	16	0	1	0	0	17	98
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Mercer	24	1	0	0	0	25	99
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	6	4	0	0	0	10	83
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	18	1	0	0	0	19	99
ThryPr	Fla AM	Ellis	18	2	0	0	1	21	97
Ed Fdn	Houstn	Librmn	13	1	0	0	0	14	98
IntrEd	Houstn	Newlin	29	0	0	0	0	29	100
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	27	0	0	0	0	27	100
EdHist	Illin	Violis	46	22	0	0	2	70	88
ChStdy	Illin	Smith	67	16	0	1	1	85	94
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	74	17	1	1	0	93	94
RdgMth	Illin	Mrgolis	30	8	0	0	0	38	93
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	25	5	1	0	0	31	94
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	5	1	1	0	0	7	90
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	17	10	1	1	0	29	84
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	5	3	0	0	0	8	85
Ed Fdn	N Colo	Jacobs							
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter							
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	48	13	0	0	0	61	93
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	16	4	0	2	0	22	94
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	17	0	0	0	0	17	100
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Howard	11	0	0	0	0	11	100
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Hungrfd	14	2	0	0	0	16	96
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	11	4	0	0	1	16	91
		TOTAL	603	131	6	5	6	751	94

*NSTEP materials not assigned

The NSTEP attitude scale item was: ✓ Pretest

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

The responses to the line DEVELOPING NEW ENERGY SOURCES were as follows:

in the course:	at:	taught by:	(100) Very imp.	(50) Some imp.	Not imp.	No opnn	Omit	Total	Median
Ed Fdn	Amer U	Umstott	18	3	0	1	1	23	96
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	19	6	0	1	1	27	92
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	11	3	0	0	0	14	93
TchMth*	Amer U	Hassler	(11)	(5)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(16)	(89)
Ch Dev*	BankSt	Cole	(15)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(17)	(97)
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	25	1	0	0	0	26	99
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	12	7	0	0	1	20	85
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Cooper	12	7	0	0	0	19	85
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Mercer	19	3	0	3	0	25	96
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	9	6	0	0	0	15	83
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	11	6	0	0	1	18	86
ThryPr	Fla AM	Ellis	17	3	1	0	0	21	94
Ed Fdn	Houstn	Librmn	16	3	0	0	0	19	95
IntrEd	Houstn	Newlin	25	7	0	0	0	32	93
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	22	8	1	0	0	31	90
EdHist	Illin	Violis	132	39	0	1	2	174	93
ChStdy	Illin	Smith	64	27	0	1	1	93	89
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	72	29	1	0	0	102	90
RdgMth	Illin	Mrgolis	30	7	0	0	0	37	94
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	25	6	1	0	0	32	93
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	7	1	0	0	0	8	96
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	35	6	1	1	0	43	95
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	8	1	0	0	0	9	97
Ed Fdn	N Colo	Jacobs							
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter							
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	71	6	0	1	0	78	98
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	28	1	0	0	0	29	91
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	15	3	0	0	0	18	95
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Howard	14	4	0	0	0	18	93
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Hungrfd	10	3	0	0	1	14	93
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	11	6	0	0	0	17	86
		TOTAL	738	202	5	9	8	962	93

*NSTEP materials not assigned

The NSTEP attitude scale item was: ✓ Posttest

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

The responses to the line DEVELOPING NEW ENERGY SOURCES were as follows:

in the course:	at:	taught by:	(100) Very imp.	(50) Some imp.	Not imp.	No opnn	Omit	Total	Median
Ed Fdn	Amer U	Umstott	13	7	0	1	0	21	87
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	12	5	0	0	0	17	90
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	9	4	0	0	0	13	89
TchMth*	Amer U	Hassler	(9)	(7)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(16)	(81)
Ch Dev*	BankSt	Cole	(10)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(13)	(93)
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	17	4	0	0	0	21	94
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	11	2	0	0	0	13	95
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Cooper	10	6	0	1	0	17	85
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Mercer	14	10	0	1	0	25	82
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	7	3	0	0	0	10	89
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	15	4	0	0	0	19	93
ThryPr	Fla AM	Ellis	15	5	1	0	0	21	90
Ed Fdn	Houstn	Librmn	13	1	0	0	0	14	98
IntrEd	Houstn	Newlin	24	5	0	0	0	29	95
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	22	5	0	0	0	27	94
EdHist	Illin	Violis	62	4	1	1	2	70	98
ChStdy	Illin	Smith	58	24	1	1	1	85	89
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	73	18	1	1	0	93	93
RdgMth	Illin	Mrgolis	30	7	0	1	0	38	94
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	23	8	0	0	0	31	91
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	5	1	1	0	0	7	90
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	26	2	1	0	0	29	97
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	7	1	0	0	0	8	96
Ed Fdn	N Colo	Jacobs							
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter							
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	56	4	0	1	0	61	98
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	15	5	0	2	0	22	92
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	15	2	0	0	0	17	97
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Howard	9	2	0	0	0	11	94
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Hungrfd	11	5	0	0	0	16	89
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	13	3	0	0	0	16	94
		TOTAL	585	147	6	10	3	751	93

*NSTEP materials not assigned

The NSTEP attitude scale item was: ✓ Pretest

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

The responses to the line EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR MEN & WOMEN were as follows:

in the course:	at:	taught by:	(100) Very imp.	(50) Some imp.	Not imp.	No opnn	Omit	Total	Median
Ed Fdn	Amer U	Umstott	18	4	0	1	0	23	94
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	21	4	1	0	1	27	94
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	9	4	1	0	0	14	86
TchMth*	Amer U	Hassler	(14)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(16)	(96)
Ch Dev*	BankSt	Cole	(16)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(17)	(98)
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	25	1	0	0	0	26	99
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	15	3	0	1	1	20	95
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Cooper	12	6	1	0	0	19	85
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Mercer	18	6	0	1	0	25	92
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	9	6	0	0	0	15	83
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	12	4	1	0	1	18	90
ThryPr	Fla AM	Ellis	11	6	4	0	0	21	77
Ed Fdn	Houstn	Librmn	12	6	0	1	0	19	88
IntrEd	Houstn	Newlin	17	14	1	0	0	32	78
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	21	9	1	0	0	31	88
EdHist	Illin	Violis	103	62	7	0	2	174	83
ChStdy	Illin	Smith	54	34	3	1	1	93	83
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	61	33	7	1	0	102	84
RdgMth	Illin	Mrgolis	14	20	2	1	0	37	65
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	20	11	1	0	0	32	85
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	8	0	0	0	0	8	100
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	26	12	4	1	0	43	85
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	6	3	0	0	0	9	88
Ed Fdn	N Colo	Jacobs							
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter							
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	60	17	1	0	0	78	93
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	25	4	0	0	0	29	96
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	16	2	0	0	0	18	97
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Howard	12	6	0	0	0	18	88
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Hungrfd	10	4	0	0	0	14	90
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	13	4	0	0	0	17	92
		TOTAL	628	285	35	8	6	962	87

*NSTEP materials not assigned

The NSTEP attitude scale item was:

✓ Posttest

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

The responses to the line EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR MEN & WOMEN were as follows:

in the course:	at:	taught by:	(100) Very imp.	(50) Some imp.	Not imp.	No opnn	Omit	Total	Median
Ed Fdn	Amer U	Umstott	15	5	1	0	0	21	90
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	12	5	0	0	0	17	90
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	10	3	0	0	0	13	93
TchMth*	Amer U	Hassler	(13)	(3)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(16)	(94)
Ch Dev*	BankSt	Cole	(12)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(13)	(98)
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	19	2	0	0	0	21	97
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	11	1	0	0	1	13	98
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Cooper	17	0	0	0	0	17	100
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Mercer	16	7	1	1	0	25	88
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	10	0	0	0	0	10	100
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	14	5	0	0	0	19	91
ThryPr	Fla AM	Ellis	15	6	0	0	0	21	90
Ed Fdn	Houstn	Librmn	10	3	1	0	0	14	90
IntrEd	Houstn	Newlin	15	13	0	1	0	29	78
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	22	5	0	0	0	27	94
EdHist	Illin	Violis	47	21	0	0	2	70	89
ChStdy	Illin	Smith	53	31	0	0	1	85	85
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	67	24	1	0	1	93	91
RdgMth	Illin	Mrgolis	21	16	1	0	0	38	80
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	20	11	0	0	0	31	87
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	6	0	1	0	0	7	96
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	19	7	3	0	0	29	87
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	7	1	0	0	0	8	96
Ed Fdn	N Colo	Jacobs							
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter							
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	52	8	0	1	0	61	96
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	18	2	0	2	0	22	97
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	14	3	0	0	0	17	95
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Howard	9	1	1	0	0	11	94
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Hungrfd	9	7	0	0	0	16	81
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	14	2	0	0	0	16	96
		TOTAL	542	189	10	5	5	751	91

*NSTEP materials not assigned

The NSTEP attitude scale item was: ✓ Pretest

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

The responses to the line REFORM OF SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM were as follows:

in the course:	at:	taught by:	(100) Very imp.	(50) Some imp.	Not imp.	No opnn	Omit	Total	Median
Ed Fdn	Amer U	Umstott	8	9	2	2	2	23	67
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	9	8	4	4	2	27	66
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	5	6	2	1	0	14	63
TchMth*	Amer U	Hassler	(5)	(10)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(16)	(63)
Ch Dev*	BankSt	Cole	(7)	(9)	(0)	(1)	(0)	(17)	(69)
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	8	11	1	5	1	26	66
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	12	4	1	3	0	20	90
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Cooper	7	7	0	4	1	19	75
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Mercer	16	3	0	6	0	25	95
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	8	6	1	0	0	15	78
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	10	7	0	0	1	18	83
ThryPr	Fla AM	Ellis	9	9	1	2	0	21	72
Ed Fdn	Houstn	Librmn	8	7	2	2	0	19	71
IntrEd	Houstn	Newlin	14	12	2	3	1	32	75
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	16	13	1	1	0	31	78
EdHist	Illin	Violis	57	94	7	14	2	174	63
ChStdy	Illin	Smith	22	59	1	10	1	93	59
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	25	53	8	15	1	102	58
RdgMth	Illin	Mrgolis	8	17	4	8	0	37	56
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	8	20	2	2	0	32	58
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	4	3	0	1	0	8	81
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	12	24	3	4	0	43	59
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	3	4	2	0	0	9	56
Ed Fdn	N Colo	Jacobs							
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter							
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	23	44	2	7	2	78	62
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	11	15	0	3	0	29	68
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	10	7	0	1	0	18	83
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Howard	6	10	0	2	0	18	65
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Hungrfd	9	5	0	0	0	14	86
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	4	11	0	1	1	17	59
		TOTAL	332	468	46	101	15	962	65

*NSTEP materials not assigned

The NSTEP attitude scale item was: ✓ Posttest

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

The responses to the line REFORM OF SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM were as follows:

in the course:	at:	taught by:	Very imp. (100)	Some imp. (50)	Not imp.	No opnn	Omit	Total	Median
Ed Fdn	Amer U	Umstott	8	10	2	0	1	21	65
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	7	10	0	0	0	17	68
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	5	4	2	1	1	13	69
TchMth*	Amer U	Hassler	(5)	(7)	(2)	(2)	(0)	(16)	(61)
Ch Dev*	BankSt	Cole	(5)	(6)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(13)	(67)
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	9	8	1	3	0	21	75
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	6	3	0	3	1	13	88
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Cooper	7	8	0	1	1	17	72
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Mercer	17	6	1	1	0	25	90
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	5	4	1	0	0	10	75
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	14	5	0	0	0	19	91
ThryPr	Fla AM	Ellis	11	7	1	1	1	21	82
Ed Fdn	Houstn	Librmn	6	4	1	3	0	14	79
IntrEd	Houstn	Newlin	15	14	0	0	0	29	77
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	11	13	1	1	1	27	69
EdHist	Illin	Violis	23	38	0	7	2	70	65
ChStdy	Illin	Smith	28	45	2	9	1	85	64
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	26	50	7	10	0	93	60
RdgMth	Illin	Mrgolis	9	23	2	4	0	38	58
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	10	18	1	2	0	31	62
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	4	2	0	1	0	7	88
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	6	17	3	3	0	29	54
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	3	4	0	1	0	8	69
Ed Fdn	N Colo	Jacobs							
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter							
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	15	36	4	5	1	61	58
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	8	10	0	4	0	22	70
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	6	10	0	1	0	17	65
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Howard	3	7	1	0	0	11	57
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Hungrfd	2	12	1	1	0	16	52
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	5	11	0	0	0	16	61
		TOTAL	269	379	31	62	10	751	66

*NSTEP materials not assigned

✓Pretest ✓Posttest

In your opinion how important are each of the following issues?	Very imp.	Of some import.	Not imp.	No opinion
Teenage drinking and drugs	___	___	___	___
Developing new energy sources	___	___	___	___
Equal opportunity for men & women	___	___	___	___
Reform of social security system	___	___	___	___

GAINS AND LOSSES IN MEDIAN SCORE

			Teenage Drinking			Energy Sources			Equal Opportunity			Soc Sec Reform			
in the course:	at:	taught by:	Md	Md	C_1	Md	Md	C_2	Md	Md	X	Md	Md	C_3	D
Ed Fdn	Amer U	Umstott	91	92	+1	46	87	-9	94	90	-4	67	65	-2	-2
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	93	92	-1	92	90	-2	94	90	-4	66	68	+2	-11
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	96	98	+2	93	89	-4	86	93	+7	63	69	+6	+17
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	91	92	+1	99	94	-5	99	97	-2	66	75	+9	-11
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	95	95	-0	85	95	+10	95	98	+3	90	88	-2	+1
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Cooper	93	98	+5	85	85	-0	85	100	+15	75	72	-3	+42
Ed Fdn	Fla AM	Mercer	94	99	+5	96	82	-14	92	88	-4	95	90	-5	+2
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	83	83	0	83	89	+6	83	100	+17	78	75	-3	+48
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	100	99	-1	86	93	+7	90	91	+1	83	91	+8	-11
ThryPr	Fla AM	Ellis	97	97	-0	94	90	-4	77	90	+13	72	82	+10	+33
Ed Fdn	Houstn	Librmn	95	98	+3	95	98	+3	88	90	+2	71	79	+8	-8
IntrEd	Houstn	Newlin	100	100	0	93	95	+2	78	78	+0	75	77	+2	-4
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	96	100	+4	90	94	+4	88	94	+6	78	69	-9	+19
EdHist	Illin	Violis	93	88	-5	93	98	+5	83	89	+6	63	65	+2	+16
ChStdy	Illin	Smith	95	94	-1	89	89	-0	83	85	+2	59	64	+5	+2
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	90	94	+4	90	93	+3	84	91	+7	58	60	+2	+12
RdgMth	Illin	Mrgolis	93	93	+3	94	94	0	65	80	+15	56	58	+2	+40
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	95	94	-1	93	91	-2	85	87	+2	58	62	+4	+5
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	96	90	-6	96	90	-6	100	96	-4	81	88	+7	-7
EdHist	Oregon	Edson	84	84	-0	95	97	+2	85	87	+2	59	54	-5	+9
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	93	85	-8	97	96	-1	88	96	+8	56	69	+13	+20
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	90	93	+3	98	98	+0	93	96	+3	62	58	-4	+10
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	93	94	+1	91	92	+1	96	97	+1	68	70	+2	-1
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	100	100	0	95	97	+2	97	95	-2	83	65	-18	+10
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Howard	97	100	+3	93	94	+1	88	94	+6	65	57	-8	+22
Ed Fdn	W Mich	Hungrfd	96	96	+0	93	89	-4	90	81	-9	86	52	-34	+11
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	90	91	+1	86	94	+8	92	96	+4	59	61	+2	+1

Between pretest and posttest seven of the 27 classes decreased their median ratings on the sex equity issue, 20 increased them. The percentage of increases was 74%. These increases were compared to the increases on the three control topics by creating a statistic, $D = 3X - C_1 - C_2 - C_3$. The differences (D) shown in the final column were analyzed using the Wilcoxon Matched-pairs Signed-ranks test, generating a T of 78 which corresponds to a normal curve Z score of 2.34. The gain in importance of the sex equity topic was therefore found to be significantly greater than the control topic gains at the .02 level of significance.

The NSTEP sex equity materials were used in five types of teacher education courses. The median pretest and posttest responses to the four issues are shown below for each type of course.

If all students responded "very important" to an issue the median would be 100. If all students responded "of some importance" the median would be 50.

	Medians		N	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pre	Post
TEENAGE DRINKING AND DRUGS				
Introduction to Education; Foundations of Education	96	97	182	127
History of Education	92	87	217	99
Educational Psychology; Child Study	92	93	245	212
Curriculum; Secondary Education; Elementary Education	93	93	178	148
Teaching Methods	95	96	140	128
Total	93	94	962	751
DEVELOPING NEW ENERGY SOURCES				
Introduction to Education; Foundations of Education	93	91		
History of Education	91	98		
Educational Psychology; Child Study	90	91		
Curriculum; Secondary Education; Elementary Education	97	96		
Teaching Methods	91	93		
Total	93	93		
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR MEN & WOMEN				
Introduction to Education; Foundations of Education	87	89		
History of Education	84	88		
Educational Psychology; Child Study	86	90		
Curriculum; Secondary Education; Elementary Education	94	96		
Teaching Methods	84	91		
Total	87	91		
REFORM OF SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM				
Introduction to Education; Foundations of Education	73	69		
History of Education	63	62		
Educational Psychology; Child Study	60	64		
Curriculum; Secondary Education; Elementary Education	67	67		
Teaching Methods	69	67		
	65	66		

At the time of the pretest (midfall 1979 in most classes) "teenage drinking and drugs" and "developing new energy sources" were seen as more important issues than "equal opportunity for men and women," and all three much more important than "reform of the social security system." Several weeks later, after instruction with the NSTEP materials, the control issues were seen as largely unchanged in importance, whereas the sex-equity issue was rated higher, almost as high as the highest two.

The largest gain occured in the Teaching Methods classes. Pretest scores in the Curriculum classes were so high that there was little room for gain on the instrument used.

The following results were obtained from the 675 students responding to this same item on both the pretest and posttest administrations.

CHANGES STUDENTS MADE IN RATING EACH OF THE FOUR TOPICS AS TO IMPORTANCE

Column 1 = number of students rating it more important on the pretest
Column 2 = number rating it of same importance on pretest and posttest
Column 3 = number of students rating it more important on the posttest
Column 4 = number of students omitting this rating
Column 5 = total number of students responding to both pre and posttest

	Teenage Drinking					Energy Sources					Sex Equity					Soc Sec Reform				
SECTIONS IN WHICH NSTEP UNIT 1 WAS ASSIGNED																				
Howard	0	8	1	1	10	0	10	0	0	10	1	8	1	0	10	3	4	2	1	10
Hungerford	2	10	2	0	14	1	11	1	1	14	2	12	0	0	14	8	5	1	0	14
Mercer	1	18	5	0	24	6	14	2	2	24	5	16	3	0	24	3	13	4	4	24
Newlin	0	29	0	0	29	2	24	3	0	29	4	20	4	1	29	3	19	5	2	29
Jacobs																				
Total	3	65	8	1	77	9	59	6	3	77	12	56	8	1	77	17	41	12	7	77
SECTIONS IN WHICH NSTEP UNIT 2 WAS ASSIGNED																				
Cooper	0	11	2	0	13	1	8	3	1	13	0	11	2	0	13	2	7	2	2	13
Edson	3	19	4	0	26	0	23	3	0	26	2	21	3	0	26	3	21	1	1	26
Total	3	30	6	0	39	1	31	6	1	39	2	32	5	0	39	5	28	3	3	39
SECTIONS IN WHICH NSTEP UNITS 1 AND 2 WERE BOTH ASSIGNED																				
Umstott	4	13	2	0	19	2	15	1	1	19	3	16	0	0	19	2	11	3	3	19
Violis	11	33	8	1	53	2	42	7	2	53	6	32	13	2	53	7	34	6	6	53
Total	15	46	10	1	72	4	57	8	3	72	9	48	13	2	72	9	45	9	9	72
SECTIONS IN WHICH EITHER UNIT 1 OR UNIT 2 WAS ASSIGNED																				
Total	21	141	24	2	188	14	147	20	7	188	23	136	26	3	188	31	114	24	19	188
SECTIONS IN WHICH NSTEP UNIT 3 WAS ASSIGNED																				
Liberman	1	10	3	0	14	1	10	3	0	14	1	10	2	1	14	1	9	3	1	14
Smith (el)	6	62	6	2	76	9	55	11	1	76	7	55	14	0	76	5	47	15	9	76
Smith (sec	6	59	9	1	75	8	56	10	1	75	5	5[illegible]	16	0	75	10	39	16	10	75
Huber	3	11	2	0	16	2	12	1	1	16	1	13	1	1	16	2	6	4	4	16
Peleg	1	6	0	0	7	1	6	0	0	7	1	6	0	0	7	0	5	0	2	7
Carter																				
Total	17	148	20	3	188	21	139	25	3	188	15	138	33	2	188	19	106	38	26	188

	Teenage Drinking					Energy Sources					Sex Equity					Soc Sec Reform				
SECTIONS IN WHICH NSTEP UNIT 4 WAS ASSIGNED																				
Byrd	1	9	0	0	10	0	8	2	0	10	0	7	3	0	10	2	6	2	0	10
Ellis	2	16	1	1	20	3	16	1	0	20	0	15	5	0	20	3	10	5	2	20
Bixler	5	45	6	0	56	5	49	2	0	56	3	45	7	1	56	12	31	8	5	56
Sellers	2	16	1	0	19	5	14	0	0	19	2	15	1	1	19	2	14	1	2	19
Cain	1	12	1	1	15	0	13	2	0	15	0	13	2	0	15	1	10	2	2	15
Total	11	98	9	2	120	13	100	7	0	120	5	95	18	2	120	20	71	18	11	120
SECTIONS IN WHICH NSTEP UNIT 5 WAS ASSIGNED																				
Ellis	1	15	0	0	16	1	10	5	0	16	2	10	4	0	16	1	12	3	0	16
SECTIONS IN WHICH NSTEP UNITS 4 AND 5 WERE BOTH ASSIGNED																				
Bullock	2	5	0	0	7	0	7	0	0	7	1	4	2	0	7	0	5	2	0	7
Roberts	0	17	0	0	17	0	16	1	0	17	1	16	0	0	17	3	11	1	2	17
Margolis	3	29	4	0	36	4	27	4	1	36	3	22	10	1	36	5	19	6	6	36
Hassler	1	10	1	0	12	1	11	0	0	12	0	9	3	0	12	1	9	0	2	12
Newman	0	23	3	0	26	2	20	4	0	26	1	19	5	1	26	2	21	1	2	26
Total	6	84	8	0	98	7	81	9	1	98	6	70	20	2	98	11	65	10	12	98
SECTIONS IN WHICH EITHER UNIT 4 OR UNIT 5 WAS ASSIGNED																				
Total	18	197	17	2	234	21	191	21	1	234	13	175	42	4	234	32	148	31	23	234
SECTIONS IN WHICH NSTEP MATERIALS WERE ONLY MADE AVAILABLE																				
Felz	4	24	3	0	31	5	22	4	0	31	2	25	4	0	31	2	20	7	2	31
Takanishi	1	11	0	1	13	4	6	3	0	13	0	10	1	2	13	1	10	1	1	13
Cuffaro	1	18	1	1	21	4	16	1	0	21	1	20	0	0	21	1	14	3	3	21
Total	6	53	4	2	65	13	44	8	0	65	3	55	5	2	65	4	44	11	6	65
Grand Total	62	529	65	9	675	69	521	74	11	675	54	504	106	11	675	85	412	104	74	675

As to the sex-equity issue then:

54 students saw it as a less important issue after studying the NSTEP unit
106 students saw sex-equity as a more important issue after studying the unit

Twice as many students increased their rating of the importance of sex-equity as decreased it. Based on the proportion of students responding to the control issues (1688/1931 decreasing or remaining unchanged and 243/1931 increasing) the expected frequencies for these 664 students would be 580.44 and 83.56. A chi square value of 6.89 is obtained which indicates an effect of change significant at the .01 level. Partly due to the imprecision of the attitude scale, however, over 75% of the students did not indicate a change in rating of the sex-equity issue's importance. Still the positive effect of the instruction was discernable.

STUDENT SELF-RATINGS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INSTRUCTION

In the course:	at:	taught by:	STUDENTS RESPONDING: Yes	No	Omit	Total
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Howard	10	0	1	11
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Hungrfd	9	3	4	16
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Mercer	13	0	12	25
Intr Ed	Houstn	Newlin	23	2	4	29
Ed Fdns	N Colo	Jacobs				
Unit 1 totals			55	5	21	81
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Cooper	15	0	2	17
Ed Hist	Oregon	Edson	11	13	5	29
Unit 2 totals			26	13	7	46
Ed Fdns	Amer U	Umstott	15	4	2	21
Ed Hist	Illin	Violis	59	4	7	70
Units 1 & 2 totals			74	8	9	91
Ed Fdns	Houstn	Libermn	11	2	1	14
Ch Stdy	Illin	Smith	71	6	8	85
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	77	7	9	93
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	13	2	2	17
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	7	0	0	7
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter				
Unit 3 totals			179	17	20	216
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	10	0	0	10
Theory	Fla AM	Ellis	20	0	1	21
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	44	3	14	61
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	18	0	4	22
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	11	1	4	16
Unit 4 totals			103	4	23	130
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	17	0	2	19
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	7	1	0	8
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	13	0	4	17
RdgMth	Illin	Margolis	32	1	5	38
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	8	2	3	13
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	25	0	2	27
Units 3 & 4 totals			85	4	14	103
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	28	2	1	31
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	(11)	(0)	(5)	(16)
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	7	5	1	13
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	11	2	8	21
Ch Dev	BankSt	Cole	(2)	(1)	(9)	(12)
Unassigned totals			46	9	10	65
Grand total			585	60	106	751

The next items indicate the extent to which the field trial students felt they had learned something from the NSTEP instruction. The first item of the posttest read as follows:

> As a result of your readings and discussions, do you feel you have a better understanding of teacher influences on sex stereotyping?
> ____Yes ____No

The tally of student responses is shown at the left.

Approximately 77% of the students responded by checking "Yes." The affirmative responses outnumbered the negative 10 to 1. Twice as many students omitted the item as responded "No." Perhaps this suggests that quite a few of the omitted responses would have been negative had the response been forced, but even so the high majority of student responses would have testified (as was the case here) that they substantially increased their understandings of sex role stereotyping.

PERCENT "YES"	
Unit 1	68%
Unit 2	57%
Both 1 & 2	81%
Unit 3	83%
Unit 4	79%
Unit 5	89%
Both 4 & 5	83%
Other	71%
Intr/Fdns	76%
Ed Hist	71%
Psy/Ch St	84%
Curr/Sec	74%
Methods	80%

Another posttest item to indicate impact:

> During the sex equity lessons did you experience a moment of special insight or see something in a new light, something to be remembered probably for a long time? ___Yes ___No (If yes and you care to, please describe it briefly on the back.)

In the course:	at:	taught by:	N	Responded: "Yes"	"No"	% Yes
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Howard	11	4	6	36%
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Hungrfd	16	3	11	19%
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Mercer	25	10	8	40%
Entr Ed	Houstn	Newlin	29	16	12	55%
Ed Fdns	N Colo	Jacobs				
UNIT 1			72	33	37	46%
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Cooper	17	10	7	59%
Ed Hist	Oregon	Edson	29	7	19	24%
UNIT 2			46	17	26	37%
Ed Fdns	Amer U	Umstott	21	12	8	57%
Ed Hist	Illin	Violis	70	29	36	41%
UNITS 1 & 2			91	41	44	45%
Ed Fdns	Houstn	Libermn	14	7	7	50%
Ch Stdy	Illin	Smith	85	46	44	54%
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	93	34	56	37%
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	17	8	8	47%
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	7	3	4	43%
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter				
UNIT 3			216	98	119	45%
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	10	5	4	50%
Theory	Fla AM	Ellis	21	18	2	86%
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	61	38	21	62%
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	22	10	10	45%
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	16	10	4	63%
UNIT 4			131	81	41	62%
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	19	15	3	79%
UNIT 5			19	15	3	79%
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	8	7	1	88%
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	17	13	3	76%
RdgMth	Illin	Margolis	38	25	9	66%
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	13	7	6	54%
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	25	13	10	52%
UNITS 4 & 5			101	65	29	64%
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	31	16	12	52%
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	(16)	(7)	(5)	(44%)
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	13	3	5	23%
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	21	8	10	38%
Ch Dev	BankSt	Cole	(13)	(0)	(2)	(0%)
OTHER			65	27	27	41%
Grand Total			749	377	326	50%

This item was constructed to identify special moments of insight, those occasions when we feel something really important has happened. It was expected that an instructor believes that everyone in class will gain new understandings, but that moments of insight occur rarely even in the best sessions. In other words, we were prepared to argue that the NSTEP teaching was a powerful educational experience if even 15% of the students responded "yes" to this item.

Perhaps the wording did not emphasize the rarity we had in mind. Over half the students responded "yes." Some indicated they had the moment of insight but not the one the author intended (e.g. one student said she suddenly realized how tactless and frenzied equity advocates are) but most who identified their insight spoke of rea'izing what an influence teachers have in forming sex role stereotypes--or a similar aim of the NSTEP teaching.

Students sometimes respond favorably to such items merely to flatter or support the instructor. Still, with each of the 27 classes exceeding our expectation, this seems to be evidence of real learning.

Examples of student insights are presented on the following page.

Perhaps 10% of the students commented on "insights." Examples:

Mathematics student: I simply became more aware of sexism.

History student: ...that teachers should be more aware of sex bias in the classroom and work to change those biases.. . Maybe teachers should work toward encouraging females to be a little more assertive and independent if they are tending toward a passive "female" role and viceversa for males--treating children as individuals, not as "male" types or "female" types.

Special education student: I realized that some of the things they were discussing in the book were true of me.

Music student: ...hadn't realized classroom stereotyping was so obvious.

Another special ed student: It's ironic... women fighting for ERA, sex equality, etc. when in school... men (or boys) are discriminated against.

American U. student: ...role of women in education--their importance, enlightening; role of black women, astounding.

Oregon student: I became painfully aware that the sex equity issue has been tied much too closely to racial discrimination. Also, that sex equity is one more example of the over-emphasis on individual rights as opposed to social needs, including the need for quality homes providing a nurturing atmosphere.

Florida A&M man: ...that women are tired of being stereotyped.

Houston woman: I always felt I was against women's lib and yet I always found things I agreed with, and tried to discard them. Now I know my stand. I want people to have the freedom to do what they choose, men or women.

San Francisco woman: The movie on sex roles in physical education hit really hard--it was so sad.

Miamian in physical education: It made a lot of sense to me and often related to previous incidents involving me or a younger brother or sister.

Illinois woman: I learned that many people feel there is a definite problem.

Foreign student: Yes, I saw a new light which is: I have the same opportunity as boys have and I can become what I want, no matter what my sex.

21-year old: The "light" that I saw was realizing how dangerous all this can be. Humanism (as opposed to theism) is rampant in society today, and the results can be disastrous. To sit and listen to a fellow future teacher blast organized religion because the hierarchy is sexist disturbs me very much. One has to be <u>very</u> careful in this area, because the belief that men and women are equal (under God) but do have different roles in life (the biological differences are indicative of this) is <u>not</u> sexist. This is my one beef.

50-year old: My class report was in the area of sex stereotyping in children's picture books. The research and organizing of the information gave me a much better insight in and awareness of this important area.

In the next item student self-ratings of knowledge of "sex role stereotyping" were compared to 3 other topics before and after sex-equity instruction. One of the control topics (student motivations) was a topic covered in many of the courses whereas the other 2 (teacher unions, youth unemployment) were more remote.

The item appeared on the pretest and posttest as shown here:

How much do you feel you know about each of these:	Quite a bit	A little	Nothing
Teacher unions	___	___	___
Student motivations	___	___	___
Sex role stereotyping	___	___	___
Youth unemployment	___	___	___

In the following data summary, student responses for each class are shown. The number after the course title is the number of students turning in an attitude scale there. The numbers for each topic are, respectively, the "quite a bit," "a little," and "nothing" frequencies there. The fourth number in each cluster is the median score for that topic in that class.

		TEACHR UNIONS				STUDENT MOTIVES				SEX ROLES				YOUTH UNEMPLY			
American U																	
Ed Fdns	23 Pre	4	13	6	46	8	14	1	63	13	10	0	81	9	10	4	63
	21 Post	4	16	1	55	13	8	0	85	19	2	0	99	5	13	3	54
Ed Psy	27 Pre	4	20	3	51	14	13	0	77	18	8	1	88	9	14	3	61
	17 Post	2	13	2	50	13	4	0	92	13	4	0	92	4	12	1	56
Tch Mth	14 Pre	1	9	4	42	9	4	0	78	10	4	0	90	4	9	1	58
	13 Post	0	10	3	43	8	5	0	84	10	3	0	95	1	10	2	48
Tch Mth*	16 Pre	(2)	(10)	(4)	(45)	(8)	(8)	(0)	(75)	(8)	(8)	(0)	(75)	(6)	(8)	(2)	(63)
	16 Post	(1)	(12)	(3)	(46)	(13)	(3)	(0)	(94)	(13)	(3)	(0)	(94)	(4)	(10)	(2)	(55)
Bank Street																	
Ch Dev*	17 Pre	(1)	(8)	(8)	(28)	(7)	(10)	(0)	(68)	(8)	(8)	(1)	(72)	(6)	(7)	(3)	(61)
	13 Post	(2)	(7)	(4)	(43)	(8)	(5)	(0)	(92)	(8)	(5)	(0)	(92)	(4)	(7)	(2)	(57)
Curric	26 Pre	1	17	8	40	13	13	0	75	17	9	0	87	4	19	3	51
	21 Post	1	11	9	32	12	9	0	81	13	8	0	85	0	19	2	47
Tch Mth	20 Pre	2	10	8	35	8	11	0	68	9	9	0	75	3	13	3	50
	13 Post	2	4	7	23	8	5	0	84	8	4	1	84	2	8	3	47
Florida A&M																	
Ed Fdns	44 Pre	6	28	9	47	17	23	4	64	14	26	4	60	21	22	0	74
	42 Post	3	32	7	47	19	23	0	71	22	20	0	77	23	18	1	79
Ed Psy	15 Pre	1	7	7	29	5	10	0	63	5	9	1	61	5	8	2	59
	10 Post	2	4	4	38	7	3	0	89	9	1	0	97	5	5	0	75
Ch Lit	18 Pre	5	10	3	55	10	8	0	80	9	9	0	75	8	8	2	69
	19 Post	4	11	4	50	12	7	0	85	12	7	0	85	9	8	2	72
Tch Mth	21 Pre	2	12	7	40	10	10	0	75	11	10	0	77	11	9	1	77
	21 Post	3	11	7	41	13	7	0	87	17	3	0	96	9	10	1	70
Houston																	
Ed Fdns	19 Pre	0	12	6	38	5	12	1	58	10	9	0	78	5	10	4	53
	14 Post	0	9	5	36	3	11	0	57	6	8	0	69	2	11	1	52
Intr Ed	32 Pre	2	17	13	34	12	20	0	65	14	18	0	69	6	19	7	49
	29 Post	1	17	4	54	20	9	0	89	20	8	1	89	6	21	2	55
Tch Mth	31 Pre	1	15	15	28	11	19	1	63	12	18	1	65	7	19	5	53
	27 Post	2	20	5	46	12	14	1	70	16	11	0	83	4	15	8	43

Illinois																			
Ed Hist	174	Pre	14	98	61	38	51	109	13	58	75	95	3	69	19	119	35	47
	70	Post	7	42	20	42	25	42	2	64	50	19	0	91	8	48	12	48
Ed Psy	195	Pre	14	113	67	38	75	114	5	65	89	102	3	71	20	139	32	48
	178	Post	19	94	64	38	94	82	1	78	100	73	2	84	16	132	27	48
Rdg Mth	37	Pre	1	20	16	31	14	20	3	64	14	23	0	65	2	24	11	41
	38	Post	2	21	15	35	24	14	0	85	27	11	0	90	3	26	9	44
Miami																		
Intr Ed	32	Pre	1	15	16	25	8	23	1	58	7	23	2	55	8	21	3	56
	31	Post	2	20	9	41	19	11	1	84	17	13	1	79	7	22	2	56
Ed Psy	8	Pre	0	8	0	50	4	4	0	75	3	4	1	63	0	7	1	46
	7	Post	1	5	1	50	5	2	0	90	5	2	0	90	1	5	1	50
Oregon																		
Ed Hist	43	Pre	11	25	7	54	17	26	0	66	21	23	0	72	7	24	12	45
	29	Post	8	18	3	57	20	9	0	89	21	8	0	90	4	23	2	52
Sec Ed	9	Pre	0	6	3	38	4	5	0	70	3	6	0	63	2	6	1	54
	8	Post	1	4	3	38	3	5	0	65	4	4	0	75	2	5	1	55
N Colorado																		
Ed Fdns																		
Ed Psy																		
San Fran St																		
Curric	29	Pre	0	24	4	46	14	13	0	77	22	6	0	93	6	18	4	53
	22	Post	0	19	3	46	16	6	0	91	19	3	0	96	3	16	3	50
Curric	78	Pre	8	54	15	47	25	49	3	61	45	31	1	82	12	50	14	49
	61	Post	5	37	19	41	30	30	0	75	37	24	0	84	5	44	12	46
Sec Ed	18	Pre	0	12	6	38	6	11	1	61	7	11	0	66	2	14	2	50
	17	Post	1	11	5	41	7	5	1	67	13	4	0	92	1	11	5	41
W Michigan																		
Ed Fdns	18	Pre	1	11	6	39	5	13	0	60	10	8	0	80	1	12	5	42
	11	Post	0	9	2	44	4	6	1	63	8	2	1	91	3	6	2	54
Ed Fdns	14	Pre	2	10	2	50	5	9	0	64	7	7	0	75	1	10	3	45
	16	Post	5	11	0	61	8	8	0	75	10	6	0	85	5	8	3	56
Tch Mth	17	Pre	2	12	3	48	9	8	0	78	9	8	0	78	1	11	4	43
	16	Post	1	15	0	52	11	5	0	89	14	2	0	96	0	15	1	48
Totals	962	Pre	83	578	295	41	359	561	33	65	453	486	17	72	173	615	162	50
	751	Post	82	465	202	44	406	334	7	80	490	250	6	87	128	511	106	51

*Since students in these two classes were not assigned NSTEP instructional materials their responses were not included in the totals.

Student Self-Rated Knowledge of:

		TEACHR UNIONS	STUDENT MOTIVES	SEX ROLES	YOUTH UNEMPLY
In classes where students were assigned NSTEP Unit 1 (instructors: Howard, Hungerford, Mercer, Newlin)					
Pre	N=89	42	63	69	52
Post	N=81	52	78	86	61
	Gain:	+10	+15	+17	+9
In classes where students were assigned Unit 2 (instructors: Cooper, Edson)					
Pre	N=62	52	67	68	53
Post	N=46	52	84	85	59
	Gain:	0	+17	+17	+6
In classes where students were assigned Units 1 & 2 (instructors: Umstott, Violis)					
Pre	N=197	39	59	70	48
Post	N= 91	46	68	92	49
	Gain:	+7	+9	+22	+1
In classes where students were assigned Unit 3 (instructors: Huber, Liberman*, Peleg, Smith)					
Pre	N=249	41	66	73	49
Post	N=216	40	78	82	49
	Gain:	-1	+12	+9	-1
In classes where students were assigned Unit 4 (instructors: Bixler, Byrd, Cain, Ellis, Sellers)					
Pre	N=159	44	67	82	52
Post	N=130	44	83	91	51
	Gain:	0	+16	+9	-1
In classes where students were assigned Unit 5 (instructor: Ellis)					
Pre	N=18	55	80	75	69
Post	N=19	50	85	85	72
	Gain:	+5	+5	+10	+3
In classes where students were assigned Units 4 & 5 (instructors: Bullock, Hassler, Margolis, Newman, Roberts*)					
Pre	N=109	33	67	68	49
Post	N=103	41	79	86	45
	Gain:	+8	+12	+18	-4
In classes where units were not required reading (instructors: Cuffaro, Felz, Hassler, Takanishi)					
Pre	N=111	35	67	70	55
Post	N= 94	39	86	85	52
	Gain:	+4	+19	+15	-3

*Roberts also assigned Unit 1; Liberman also made Unit 4 available; Cuffaro made 4 available; Felz made 1, 2 & 3 available; Hassler 4 & 5; Takanishi 1 & 2.

Entries in this table are median ratings of knowledge of 4 topics for students having different reading assignments. The instructors who only made the materials "available" are clustered last. They appear to have caused as much gain in ratings as the instructors who "assigned" particular readings.

Looking at the 2 control topics we concluded that a gain between -4 and +4 is a standard for comparison. For all 8 groups the gains in SEX EQUITY exceeded the standard, most were 3 times as large. The gains for STUDENT MOTIVATIONS were also well above the standard, but of course, that also was a main topic in most courses.

Some of the gains, particularly with Unit 4, seemed to be curtailed by a ceiling effect. For the more experienced students there should have been higher categories available. Still, the scale revealed a clear picture of students reporting themselves more knowledgable after having access to any of the NSTEP units.

SELF-DECLARED KNOWLEDGE OF SEX ROLE STEREOTYPING

In the course:	at:	taught by:	students indicating loss	no change	indicating gain	more gain than loss
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Howard	1	8	1	0
Ed Fdns	W Mich	Hungrfd	1	9	4	+
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Mercer	2	13	9	+
Entr Ed	Houstn	Newlin	1	20	8	+
Ed Fdns	N Colo	Jacobs				
Ed Fdns	Fla AM	Cooper	1	8	4	+
Ed Hist	Oregon	Edson	1	18	6	+
Ed Fdns	Amer U	Umstott	1	11	7	+
Ed Hist	Illin	Violis	5	29	18	+
Ed Fdns	Houstn	Libermn	3	9	2	-
Ch Stdy	Illin	Smith	10	44	19	+
Ed Psy	Illin	Smith	12	45	18	+
Ed Psy	Amer U	Huber	2	8	6	+
Ed Psy	Miami	Peleg	0	4	3	+
Ed Psy	N Colo	Carter				
Ed Psy	Fla AM	Byrd	0	5	5	+
Theory	Fla AM	Ellis	1	10	8	+
Curric	SFrnSt	Bixler	5	42	8	+
Curric	SFrnSt	Sellers	1	13	4	+
TchMth	W Mich	Cain	2	7	6	+
Ch Lit	Fla AM	Ellis	2	9	5	+
Sec Ed	Oregon	Bullock	2	2	3	+
Sec Ed	SFrnSt	Roberts	2	7	8	+
RdgMth	Illin	Margolis	2	18	16	+
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	0	11	1	+
TchMth	Houstn	Newman	1	14	11	+
IntrEd	Miami	Felz	3	14	14	+
TchMth	Amer U	Hassler	(0)	(9)	(5)	(+)
TchMth	BankSt	Tknishi	2	6	3	+
Curric	BankSt	Cuffaro	2	17	2	0
Ch Dev	BankSt	Cole	(0)	(6)	(1)	(+)
		Observed frequencies	66	398	199	
		Expected frequencies (based on 2 remote controls)		550.6	112.4	

The widespread gains in avowed knowledge of sex role stereotyping indicated on the 3 previous pages might have been attributable to large numbers of students with low ratings on the pretest not responding at all to the posttest. This was checked by tallying the results again for students only who took both pretest and posttest. Shown at the left are the tallies, for each class, of those students rating themselves less knowledgable on the posttest, more knowledgable on the posttest, and at the same level.

Of the 27 classes only one had more students indicating loss than those indicating gain. Two had an equal number of students "gaining" and "losing."

Comparing GAIN against OTHER (by combining loss and no change) and using expected frequencies based on the ratings of these same students on the two remote topics (teacher unions and youth unemployment) a chi square value of 80.3 was calculated, a value significant at the .01 level.

The widespread gains apparently were not an artifact of low raters dropping out. We would conclude that in a population of teacher education students akin to those of this field study, taking instruction of this kind, we would expect that students would consistently increase their self-ratings of knowledge of sex role stereotyping after exposure to NSTEP sex equity instructional materials.

This increased knowledge appeared to match the increase in knowledge of "student motivations," a key teacher-education topic. (Freq.= 60 421 183)

ATTITUDES ON PARTICULAR ISSUES

It seemed desirable to inquire into specifics about vocations and careers. The item shown below was asked on both pretest and posttest:

There are claims that young women do not become doctors and engineers as much as young men do, and that young men do not have equal opportunity to become nurses and secretaries. How do you feel about that?	Pre-test	Post-test
___It is untrue. They have equal opportunities.	16%	14%
___There are good reasons why most doctors and engineers should be men, and nurses and secretaries should be women.	5%	4%
___The opportunities are not equal, but it is not proper for teachers to try to change such things.	2%	4%
___The opportunities are not equal and teachers should help youngsters consider nontraditional career options.	77%	77%

Responses changed little. The popularity of the view that teachers should be working to correct existing barriers to career choice ranged from around 90% at Bank Street and San Francisco State down to around 70% at Oregon and American University on down to 50% at Florida A&M. Gain scores appeared unreliable.

But noting that the third choice, here a rare response, did double in frequency, a check was made to see if the increase was because people were becoming alerted to inequities through the instruction. This might show up in movement to that third choice from the first two choices. When we checked the tallies we found that over 1/4 of those choosing the third choice on the posttest had picked the first choice on the pretest, but the majority had picked the fourth choice on the pretest. We concluded that we did not have evidence here that the instruction was affecting those "least persuaded" that there were inequities in vocational opportunity.

Wanting to learn more about the disposition of these students toward professional responsibility for the improvement of social conditions, the following item was presented. Two thirds of the students chose the more passive response. During early trials in the development of the item many students had indicated need for emphasis on Christian or traditional values, but only 1 of 12 made that choice here. From these responses one would not expect aggressive teaching of sex equity by these "teachers-to-be."

During the 1960s attempts were made to use the educational system to bring about social change. How do you feel about improving our society by teaching social values?	Pre-test	Post-test
___Schools should lead the way to restore the traditional values in our society.	8%	7%
___Schools should lead the way toward correcting the inequities in our society.	20%	20%
___Schools should teach about values, but should not pressure toward any one value commitment.	65%	67%
___Other:	8%	7%

		Pretest	Posttest
Do you feel that girls have to overcome more social pressure than boys to enroll in advanced science and math courses? ___Yes ___No	Yes	50%	62%
	No	50%	38%

Studies of inschool effects of sex equity were reported in the NSTEP materials. Realization of these effects showed up in responses to the above item as "yes" responses increased in 20 of the 27 field trial courses surveyed.

		Pretest	Posttest
Some school tax money is used for athletics. Do you object to spending more for boys' than girls' athletic programs? ___Yes ___No	Yes	68%	63%
	No	32%	37%

The number of students who expressed objection to disproportionate spending in athletics was surprising. Instruction here apparently did not increase it.

Is this part of "the problem?" Teachers give girls encouragement to be gentle and caring more than boys--and they tolerate assertiveness in boys much more than in girls. ___No, it's not part of any important problem I know of. ___Yes, it's part of it. ___I don't know.	No	14%	8%
	Yes	65%	81%
	DK	22%	11%

How sex equities may affect personality also was stressed. The change in pre- and posttest responses to the above item was dramatic.

==========

Summary. The field trial attitude testing indicated a pattern of favorable student reaction to the NSTEP instruction. As is often the case with surveys, the instrument here was too crude to ascertain the complex feelings people have about customs and social opportunities. Many responses could have been for effect, not revealing the respondent's true attitudes. However, the most reasonable interpretation of the results reported here is that these education students support preservice teaching of sex equity issues and by and large found the NSTEP materials suitable.

The diversity of experience and interest among students obviously was large. This attitude scale appeared to be more appropriate for the less sophisticated students, having a ceiling effect for many. It was not precise enough to discover whether the materials were more suitable for one group than another.

Particular attention was paid to the reception given the 5 separate NSTEP units. No one unit stood out as uniquely weak or strong.

Reactions to the NSTEP Materials

When first introduced to them many students thought Non-sexist Teacher Education meant "support women's rights." As they read the modules they became more aware of how sexism affects men as well as women--boys in school as well as girls. However, even then a substantial number of people commented that the modules took a woman's advocacy position and left men out. This was said to be especially true of Unit 1, to some extent of Unit 2 and the others. While there were those who felt women's advocacy was the position of the modules there were those who were pleased to discover a non-sexist approach. In fact many came to a first realization that sexism hurts men as well as women.

The style of the NSTEP modules was seen to be more "popular" and "advocative" than most materials used for students in education courses. What some called the "workbook approach" was criticized by a number of students and faculty members. Some who see work books the bane of elementary education saw these modules delivering a hidden message, the "hidden curriculum." Many students enjoyed the style and found the exercises interesting and engaging.

It was obvious in these classes that there are other ways of teaching. Some courses are organized in such a way that an adjunct unit does not fit nicely. Some instructors found it difficult to merge their own teaching style with the underlying assumptions of the NSTEP unit. Others did not try to fit the materials in as a unit, but brought in parts when they related to course activities.

Most of the 30 instructors examined all five modules. Few read them all carefully. No students were known to have read all 5. Their comments, therefore, to the evaluators were almost never about the whole set but about particular units. What would happen if students were exposed to all five modules? Would they find them redundant? Would they become bored with sex equity? Would it be too much? From this evaluation we do not know. There were a few students who had used three. Those students' comments were generally favorable--they said the information in one module built upon another and stimulated an interest in reading more. Often students who had only one course and one or two units to read would ask for more information. Such as for psychology when they had only social foundations or vice versa. Students asked about information on sexism in materials and books. Many were familiar with sexism in books.

As it was, in many classes people thought there was not enough time to do justice to the materials they had. There were always other issues and the regular course offerings. Karen Margolis spent extra time on the issues of sex equity, requiring extra projects and bringing in extra exercises. While her students were enthusiastic and enjoyed the discussion at the time, later they were unhappy when the department final exam (on reading methods) gave no attention to sex equity. Then they thought more time should have been spent on how to teach reading.

Instructors used one, two or three of the modules in a single course or in a combination of two courses. Units 2 and 5 were used at seven of the ten sites, Unit 1 at nine, Unit 3 at eight and Unit 4 at all ten.

In most classrooms only part of the modules were discussed. The expectation was that students read the other parts. Nearly all instructors and students found the materials readable. Comments on the individual modules follow:

Sexism in American Education was fit into Foundations of Education courses and was generally well received by both students and faculty. Jerry Felz thought Rita Bornstein came on a little too strong"pro-women." Some students thought the story of Emma was overdone. Student reaction to the questionnaire ranged from laughter (perhaps embarrassment) to dismay when they realized how men and women were stereotyped. Many students appreciated having information to support ideas already held in order to argue convictions more forcefully. They were especially glad to have the definitions and were surprised by the Quiz on Women in the world of work. Title IX was of interest to many and suggestions were made to include more on Title IX. Mike Howard requested, "how to make a complaint." One student thought the presentation of what Title IX is should have preceded the quiz and misinformation. Bornstein was seen to have made special effort to deal with remediation, going beyond mere illumination.

Unit II, Woman's Place is in the School: The Impact of Women in American Education was criticized about everything from sentence structure to choice of title to unfamiliarity with the historiography of education in the past 15 years. Violas said, "Unfortunately, Kerber places her story of women in American schools in a structure much like the Cubberley model. What she seems to do is 'round out' the picture by placing women in and giving women 'their due.'.... She does not include the cultural, structural, economic, and social class forces at work and given her model of explanation, it is doubtful that these aspects can be embraced to provide a more meaningful analysis of sexism."

There were students, however, who were pleased to find information about women in history and were delighted with inserts from original sources. Jerry Felz thought it was an interesting module and felt that many students could benefit from reading it. He said it was sophisticated enough for most lower level undergraduates.

The research reported in Boys and Girls in School: A Psychological Perspective by Joy and Meredith Gall stimulated a great deal of discussion, but some found the reading too much a presentation of facts. For them it wasn't personalized enough. The greatest criticism came from those who objected to only two theoretical perspectives being presented--biological and social, leaving out the Interactionists such as Piaget and the Freudian Psychologists. They thought the issue of sexism was subordinate to the issue of poor classroom teaching presented in the examples. Lu Ann Smith suggested that more of Carol Dwek's and Sheila Tobias' work be incorporated and that Bruce Hare's research on Black and White achievement be included. Some instructors thought brain lateralization was not explained fully and should be or left out altogether. Lu Ann suggested that the sections on math and reading be reversed so that males would realize earlier that the discussion was sex equity and not women's rights.

Myra and David Sadker's Between Teacher and Student: Overcoming Sex Bias in the Classroom met with mixed reviews. A student at San Francisco State said maybe it was a little too gentle for those whose consciousness was not raised. Others found the materials too strident--blaming teachers too much, insufficiently considering home and societal influences. Many students were pleased to read it and reflect upon their own and other teachers' behaviors. Though surprised by the subtleties of sexism in the classroom, they were convinced by the statistics. Glad they were to find out about behaviors detrimental to girls and boys. Sexist attitudes toward boys was particularly enlightening. Some criticized the workbook type reading--thinking it would be better to have no blanks to fill in. Many seemed to find "pick a pattern" helpful. Some criticized the observation Sheet #4 saying that it was too difficult to keep all the categories in mind as they observed, and thought writing comments might be better. They liked the list of resources at the end.

Beyond the Dick and Jane Syndrome: Confronting Sex Bias in Instructional Materials created the least controversy. However, there were those who would have Donna M. Gollnick and Myra and David Sadker make less of bias in language. One person thought that "a band-aid approach" to sexism, changing chairman to chair person and mankind to humankind, etc. Most students were surprised with the Susan B. test to find how little they knew about famous women. They seemed to think stereotyping, imbalance, selectivity, unreality, fragmentation/isolation and linguistic bias were good categories and they generally liked the exercise. Still, some thought it too much a workbook approach.

The impressions from the interviews and observations seemed to corroborate the findings of the survey results. For example the two modules, Between Teacher and Student: Overcoming Sex Bias in the Classroom and The Dick and Jane Syndrome: Confronting Sex Bias in Instructional Materials seemed to create much thinking about classrooms, children and the teacher's influence. Perhaps because the two modules were most directly related to classroom instruction and the fact that in general the classes in which they were used were composed of either elementary or secondary education students--unlike some foundations courses where many students were from other fields.

One question in the survey questionnaire shows the impact of these two modules. To the question: "During the sex equity lessons did you experience a moment of special insigh or see something in a new light; something to be remembered probably for a long time?" students using modules 4 and 5 clearly reported more instances of special insight. Unit 4 alone 62%, Unit 5 alone (one class) 79% and Units 4 and 5 was 64%. Other units and combinations ranged from 37% to 46%. These units seemed to jolt some students. They were overwhelmed to think that they could influence a child's conception of herself/himself and therefore limit options or open options for development intellectually and emotionally. Units 4 and 5 clearly gave students new insight into their roles as teachers.

Reactions of non-participants. The field trials created some small interest in sex equity outside the classrooms in which they were being used. Perhaps because the Dean of the College of Education is a woman committed to sex equity, many of the people at a predominately Black school, FAMU, showed interest in the equity project. Dean Martin expressed goals to eliminate sexism and racism at a faculty meeting at which she invited the evaluator to speak about the NSTEP field trials. At the same University a faculty member who teaches math said women excelled in math and outnumbered men in her classes. She went on to say that in a recent test the women scored not 2 or 3 but 10 or 20 points higher than the male students. At FAMU many women hold administrative posts including the Vice President for Academic Affairs who expressed her goals to promote sex equity. While sex equity was a concern for many people there were male faculty members and at least one female member of the faculty who were very much concerned with race equity and wondered if it shouldn't take precedence over sex equity.

At Western Michigan, Mary Cain found it difficult to get many in the Education Department interested in non-sexist teacher education. She would like to present what is available on non-sexist teacher education at a seminar for faculty, but she can't get on the program. She says other topics are presented, such as bilingual-bicultural, mainstreaming, etc., but not non-sexist teacher education. "Guess I'll have to start yelling," she said. Mary said she was a feminist (which she equates with humanist) since she was eight years old, "Why couldn't I hold the flag?" Now she teaches a non-sexist teacher education course

and chairs an Affirmative Action Title IX Commission for the local AAUP. Some questions were asked by other faculty about the field trials and one member of the faculty reported that in Michigan school districts have been investigated with the result that women's coaches are directed to be paid the same as men's coaches.

At Illinois, the possibility of a new course in the Ed Psych Department, "Sex Role Socialization," grew out of the interest in the field testing of the modules. If approved four of the five modules will be used in the course. The Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, after reading the modules, commented, "Information only," while the Associate Dean for Teacher Education said the materials were good. An evaluator who reviewed the materials was surprised to find that so much could be written on the topic.

At San Francisco State people were accustomed to considering multiculuralism and equity in many spheres. The modules were most useful to their efforts to promote equality in the schools. In the South West, the new Dean of Education at Houston showed an interest in the topic and wanted to know more about what the modules teach. Interest was varied. At Greely, Mike Jacobs found colleagues who were very interested while Kyle Carter found it more difficult to interest his colleages.

In one of the three sites where authors of the modules reside, the University of Miami, Jerry Felz made the modules available to other faculty, but no one responded. At the University of Oregon two instructors, Terry Bulloch and Janet Moursand recommended the materials to others while Toby Edson did not. Four of their college colleagues are NSTEP authors: Patricia and Richard Schmuck and Joy and Meredith Gall. (The Schmucks were working on a module for a field experience course.) It was not apparent this local authoring stirred up extra interest there.

It seemed that at these sites and elsewhere additional instructors willing to use the materials will be found, but the gradient of interest is rather steep. To gain each new participating instructor more effort needs to be spent. The mobilization of education faculties becomes more difficult, not easier.

Meta-Evaluation of the Field Trial

In this brief section will be comments about the field trial and the reasons why results might be considered biased. It is the judgment of the evaluators that these biases are insignificant.

It was written into the original contract between the Women's Educational Equity Act Program and American University that there would be a field trial of the to-be-developed teacher educational materials, and that this field trial would be evaluated.

There is always a question as to whether the developers or the evaluators should organize the field trial. If the developers do it they continue trying to change the materials or arrangements so that there will be a good look at their best effort. Sometimes that is bad. The ETS evaluation of PLATO was unsuccessful because PLATO was always in revision.

If the evaluators do it they try to keep the developers from being a direct and continuing influence on field operations (because that will not be the way the materials will be used in the future). They then settle on a fixed but sometimes inadequate approximation of the thing being evaluated and its context.

In this field trial the developers made most of the arrangements with participating colleges and instructors, paid the instructors a small fee and gave them a trip to Washington. In a small sense, the instructors owed something to the project. Whether that made the instructors more favorably disposed to the materials is not known. Certainly the instructors gave NSTEP considerable criticism, but perhaps not as much as if they had purchased the materials impersonally.

The evaluators, on the other hand, imposed themselves on the instructors, asking for extra time, arrangements, hospitality. They made these requests in a personal way, and looked forward to pleasant colleaguial exchanges with them. These interactions may have influenced the response too.

It appeared that field trial arrangements were regularly worked out directly with instructors rather than their administrators. Ordinarily this is risky for it makes it easier for participants to withdraw, as happened here, but not to a serious extent. In selecting the instructors the instructional contexts were automatically set. Luckily, the resulting courses, classrooms, and universities constituted samples having much of the variety of the teacher education in the U.S. today. They weren't random samples, of course, but they appear to be representative samples suitable for field study evaluation projects.

A much more serious concern is the degree to which the participating instructors were predisposed generally to the teaching of sex equity to preservice students and thus possibly desiring to see the project succeed. Certainly as a group these instructors were favorably disposed to the purposes of the project, much more so than a random sample of instructors would have been. But it is also true that among the sophisticates in any work there is a greater tendency to quibble over (what appear to most audiences to be) minor details, and some of the quibbling gets pretty heated. In this instance some of the instructors who appeared to have the greatest experience with the teaching of sex equity also appeared to have some of the strongest reservations about the project and its materials.

Thus it is doubtful that the selection of instructors with a generally favorable disposition biased the results substantially in a favorable direction.

The student interviewees and log writers were clearly unrepresentative of their classes, being those who were interested, motivated, perhaps currying favor with their instructors. A disproportionate number (about half) of these were male. They too probably were students who would, more often than not, make responses the instructor wanted to hear. This all is not to discredit their responses but to qualify them. Most of these data appeared to be quite consistent with remarks heard in class and with many remarks volunteered on margins of the attitude scale. (Biased information, of course, is not without informational value.) Still a better selection of student assistance should have been made.

It was not apparent to the evaluators that the results were influenced either pro or con by the way in which the field study was arranged, but if there was any at all, the guess would be that the bias resulted in a more favorable response to the materials.

The Evaluation. As to other deficiencies of the evaluation, as a number of respondents pointed out the attitude scale questions were crude, often not allowing students to indicate the depth of their feeling or the complexity of their perceptions. At the sites it may have been just the opposite. It appeared that too much time was spent there getting to know how people felt about sex equity in education and not enough about how the NSTEP materials were used and how they could be improved. These deficiencies made the evaluation less accurate and informative than it could have been but it is almost certain that they did not invalidate the results.

Teaching about Sexism in Schools

In many classes people thought there was not enough time to do justice to the materials. Yet they felt they couldn't spend more time because of regular course offerings and other mandated programs, such as mainstreaming, child abuse, etc. Karen Margolis did spend extra time on the issues of equity by requiring extra projects and bringing in extra exercises. While the students were enthusiastic and enjoyed the discussions at the time, later they were unhappy when they took a departmental exam on reading methods. Then they thought time should have been spent on how to teach reading.

In most classrooms only part of the modules were discussed. It often took time when the topic was first discussed for many students to reflect upon their own experiences and think about what sex equity meant to them on a personal basis. As Kit Newman pointed out, "for such an emotional topic, a necessary first step." However, in some instances the consciousness raising was as far as the students progressed.

Trying to cover content area and trying to make teacher education relevant conflicted in these instances where students needed time to reflect upon their own experiences. Instructors experiment with different ways of providing field experiences to help relate the theory to practice. To give teachers some idea of what teaching is all about, Jerry Felz arranges for his students to visit many different educational institutions such as a Montessori school, an air flight attendant training school, a public high school, a school for the handicapped, etc. After taking Jerry's course some students thank him for helping them make a decision to leave education. Others change their majors from elementary to secondary from special ed. to elementary, etc. The field experience takes time and effort but the results are more relevant education.

At San Francisco State courses are combined to allow the instructors time to spend with students to get to know them in the field and in the classroom. It takes time and effort to develop competent, sensitive teachers.

There are differences in the amount of optimism about securing a teaching position. At Houston where the city is growing by leaps if not catapulting, teachers expect to get jobs when they finish training and many are teaching as they finish their degrees. In Michigan a student complained about teachers who are only teachers because it's a nine month position while she (a dedicated to the profession teacher) may not be able to secure a position. At Bank Street where all are graduate students many are employed full time. At Illinois the majority of students are average college students 19 to 21 years old. Prospects for jobs aren't too good in light of schools closing and budgets tightening. There are not as many freshmen and women who plan to go into teaching. Business is a better bet and the business school is filling up. As women students become aware of other options they may study in more varied fields.

The field of education is still predominately women with men in the administrative and better paying positions. An area where women are making headway is sports. More women are getting scholarships in sports because of Title IX. This may increase the number of women in the field of Physical Education.

Students and their instructors, sincere in their efforts to provide quality education for all children, consider sex equity important.

Equity is a sacred principle in America and education has been the hope for achieving it. Even though education does not always open the doors to equality, education should not contribute to closing the doors. This seems to be the feeling of those students and faculty interviewed and observed in the field trials. Equal opportunity in education was important to most, but interpretations of equity were different and many didn't see the subtleties of institutional sexism. Others recognized the complexities and thought the materials were not broad enough or encompassing enough to cover the issue of sex equity.

In teasing out the goals of the project and of the people who were using them, a definition of what sex equity meant to them emerged. It seemed to us that the overall sense of sex equity for those who participated in the field trials could be expressed as Alice S. Rossi did in an essay, Equality Between the Sexes.

> By sex equity I mean a socially androgenous conception of the roles of men and women, in which they are equal in such spheres as intellectual artistic, political and occupational interests and participation, complementary only in those spheres dictated by physiological differences between the sexes..... an assumption that by far the majority of the differences between sexes which have been noted in social research are socially rather than physiologically based and what proportion are socially based is a question the social and physiological sciences cannot really answer at the present time. It is sufficient... to note that the opportunities for social change toward a closer approximation of equality between sexes are large enough within the area of sex differences now considered to be socially determined to constitute a challenging arena for thought and social action.*

---

*Alice S. Rossi, "Equality Between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal," in Woman in America, edited by Robert J. Lifton, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964.